A U M

Yes, the right act
Is less, far less than the right-thinking mind.
Seek refuge in thy soul: have there thy heaven!
Scorn them that follow virtue for her gifts
The mind of pure devotion—even here—
Casts equally aside good deeds and bad,
Passing above them. Unto pure devotion
Devote thyself: with perfect meditation
Comes perfect act, and the righted-hearted rise—
More certainly because they seek no gain—
Forth from the bands of body, step by step,
To highest seats of bliss.
—*Arnold's Bhagavad-Gita.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. V **MARCH, 1917** **No. 5**

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

STUDIES IN ISIS UNVEILED

I.

INTRODUCTORY.

In Isis Unveiled the explanations of a hundred mysteries lie but half buried, only waiting for the application of intelligence guided by a little Occult knowledge to come out into the light of day.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY.

ISIS UNVEILED is the first published work of H. P. Blavatsky. It was issued at New York by the publishing house of J. W. Bouton in the fall of 1877.

The plates were stereotyped and in all six numbered editions have been issued with the Bouton imprint at varying dates down to 1895. All these editions are identical except that after the fourth edition a new portrait of Madame Blavatsky was used for the frontispiece of the first volume.

Subsequently, the Bouton plates came into the possession of Madam Katherine Tingley and were used for the "Point Loma Edition" of Isis Unveiled, with such inserts and changes as that edition contains.

Another edition of Isis Unveiled was issued in London in 1911, by the Theosophical Publishing Society, affiliated with the Theosophical society of which Mrs. Annie Besant is President. This

edition has the same pagings as the original Bouton editions, but, being reset throughout, is authentic and accurate only to the extent that it faithfully reproduces the original text.

The Bouton editions of Isis Unveiled are now, of course, out of print, but can still be obtained with a little effort, through the medium of the dealers in second-hand and rare books.

Isis Unveiled is H. P. B.'s first gift to Humanity. In many respects it is her greatest. It is the first direct communication from the Masters of Wisdom to the world of men in many, many centuries. It constitutes Their invitation to all who will listen, to enter upon the study of the Spirit and Nature with Those who know how to teach. It is intended to convey information and do a work of clearance for the individual student, without which he cannot make true progress, and without which Their subsequent Teachings cannot be properly availed of.

Nature's modes and actions do not obey the whims or the mandates of the individual. The student succeeds only as he waits upon and studies nature in her operations. The laws and processes of the higher nature are the same. They can only be successfully studied in their manifestation, and these do not conform to the prejudices or the preconceptions of the would-be neophyte in their mysteries.

More than once, in later years, H. P. B. threw out hints about Isis. These hints, like the book itself, were addressed to the intuition and not to the curiosity of the reader. Thus, writing in *The Theosophist* in November, 1882, five years after the publication of Isis, she said, in the form of a mere *obiter dictum:*

> In Isis the explanations of a hundred mysteries lie but half buried . . . only waiting for the application of intelligence guided by a little Occult knowledge to come out into the light of day.

This was written and published in India—on the other side of the world from New York. Nearly eight years later, in May, 1891—and again on the other side of the world from India—she gave a final statement in regard to Isis in her article, "My Books," printed in *Lucifer* at London. This was written a few days before her death, when she knew she was going, and was not printed till after her departure from the body. It ought, therefore, to bear an especial significance to all who believe in her sincerity and good faith. This is what she said:

> I maintain that Isis contains a mass of original and never hitherto divulged information on occult subjects. . . . I defend the ideas and teachings in it, with no fear of being charged with conceit, since *neither ideas nor teaching are mine,* as I have always declared; and I maintain that both are of the greatest value to mystics and students of Theosophy. . .
>
> Every word of information found in this work or in my later writings, comes from the teachings of our Eastern Mas-

ters, and . . . many a passage in these works has been written by me *under their dictation.*

Almost numberless are the false charges that have been made against H. P. B. and against Isis Unveiled. These are constantly being revived by new generations of writers, theosophical and otherwise. They rest upon malice, conceit or ignorance. Few indeed, even among earnest and sincere students, have taken the trouble to get the facts, and fewer still have made diligent study of the work itself.

It is human nature to desire to reap where we have not sown. It is so much easier to take things at second-hand. Yet the very first lesson in Occultism is accuracy as to the facts. And again, students often begin with the *Secret Doctrine,* which they read upside down, without aim or direction, because they have neither undergone the necessary preliminary study and training, nor *established a connection.* Making no headway, they fall easily prey to the thousand and one claims as to teachers and teachings. Seeking something easy and promising, they go far astray in blind paths —or worse.

Not for naught nor in lightness did H. P. B. write on the title page of Isis that it is a *Master Key* to the mysteries that encompass the two greatest problems with which the human mind has wrestled in all ages—Science and Theology.

We propose, therefore, in perseverance of a most solemn and sacred self-imposed obligation to our fellow students of all organizations and of none, to take up for consideration some of the teachings in Isis Unveiled. If our fellow students everywhere will join with us in the work, and foster it with their study, their thought, their questions and their contributions, we do not doubt that we will all make discoveries of great value, and be doubly enriched—enriched in what we achieve for others, and enriched in what we achieve for ourselves.

For the differences that separate us, weakening each, and dividing the power of all to help on the progress of the race, are due to our ignorance and misconceptions. And these, in turn, are due to our neglect to study and apply what the Masters have recorded for our instruction and guidance.

If H. P. B. was the Agent of Masters, and did Their work, what She has left of record must be a true guide for every student in any and every difficulty, and must have been recorded for that very purpose. That she *was* Their Agent is shown by the Message she brought, by her life, by her word, and by Theirs. To suppose that anything she wrote can be neglected, cast aside, explained away, or rejected, is to affirm that the Masters are as weak, as impotent and as unreliable as human nature.

We believe that the more we study Isis Unveiled, the more will our conviction be strengthened in Theosophy, in Masters, and

in H. P. B., Their Messenger. We believe that only by such study will our present differences be dissolved, and that *unity of aim, purpose and teaching* obtain among all students of Theosophy that assuredly obtains among the Masters of Wisdom.

In that profound conviction we undertake our present task; one more link in the chain of effort to "teach, preach, and above all, practise Theosophy." May Ishwara be near!

TOPICS FOR MEETINGS*

How far should branches go in permitting the discussions at their meetings to be led into questions concerning topics not directly bearing on the theosophical philosophy or in permitting members or outsiders to detail their views on socialism, spiritualism, single tax, or the like, unless they have a direct bearing on Universal Brotherhood?

William Q. Judge.—While branches have the right to have any sort of discussion they please, it has been found that those which import into the meetings subjects not such as we call theosophical, have a quarrelsome or precarious existence. Special topics, such as Socialism or Single Tax, always lead to friction and away from Theosophy, because they create partisan strife. And again, members should not attempt to make special applications of Theosophy to such topics unless they know both so well as to be able to instruct their hearers. And do members in general know Theosophy, even, so well as to be qualified to apply it to anything but daily life and conduct? I do not think so. If a Socialist or Single Taxer, or rabid Spiritualist is asked to speak on any one of those subjects, he will be found to be a partizan or extremist, and most likely, if well up in his particular topic, he will not be versed in Theosophy.

Theosophy is so new, and its adherents so few, and all reformatory questions (as specialties) are so changeable and evanescent, it is far wiser for a branch to go on studying Theosophy and propagating it together with the idea of Universal Brotherhood than to offer particular explanations on empirical topics. Were Theosophy understood and practised everything needing reform would be at once reformed.

I think the time to settle this question is later, because as yet the mass of members in general are not versed in Theosophy. They are unwilling to go to school though they need schooling in Theosophy. When they can thoroughly and at the word explain the doctrines we promulgate they will then be competent to touch other matters.

---

* This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* for January, 1896. The title used is our own.—[ED. THEOSOPHY.]

Lucifer 9
page 8

THE SUBSTANTIAL NATURE OF MAGNETISM*

MATERIALISTS who arraign the Occultists and Theosophists for believing that every Force (so called) in Nature has at its origin a substantial NOUMENON, an Entity, conscious and intelligent, whether it be a Planetary (Dhyan Chohan) or an Elemental, are advised to fix their attention, first of all, on a far more dangerous body than the one called the Theosophical Society. We mean the Society in the U. S. of America whose members call themselves the Substantialists. We call it *dangerous* for this reason, that this body, combining in itself dogmatic Church Christianity, *i. e.*, the anthropomorphic element of the Bible—with sterling Science, makes, nevertheless, the latter subservient in all to the former. This is equivalent to saying, that the new organization, will, in its fanatical dogmatism—if it wins the day—lead on the forthcoming generations to anthropomorphism past redemption. It will achieve this the more easily in our age of Science-worship, since a show of undeniable learning must help to impart additional strength to belief in a gigantic human god, as their hypotheses, like those of modern materialistic science, may be easily built to answer their particular aim. The educated and thoughtful classes of Society, once set free from ecclesiastical thraldom, could laugh at a St. Augustine's or a "venerable" Bede's scientific data, which led them to maintain on the authority and dead letter of what they regarded as Revelation that our Earth, instead of being a sphere, was flat, hanging under a crystalline canopy studded with shining brass nails and a sun no larger than it appears. But the same classes will be always forced by public opinion into respecting the hypotheses of modern Science—in whatever direction the nature of scientific speculation may lead them. They have been so led for the last century—into crass Materialism; they may be so led again in an opposite direction. The cycle has closed, and if Science ever falls into the hands of the Opposition—the learned "Reverends" and bigoted Churchmen—the world may find itself gradually approaching the ditch on the opposite side and be landed at no distant future in crass anthropomorphism. Once more the masses will have rejected true philosophy—impartial and unsectarian—and will thus be caught again in new meshes of their own weaving, the fruitage and results of the reaction created by an all-denying age. The solemn ideal of a universal, infinite, all-pervading Noumenon of Spirit, of an impersonal and *absolute* Deity, will fade out of the human mind once more, and will make room for the MONSTER-GOD of sectarian nightmares.

Now, modern official science is composed—as at present—of 5 per cent. of undeniable axiomatic truths and facts, and of 95 per

* This article first appeared in *Lucifer* for September, 1891.

cent. of mere speculation. Furthermore, it has laid itself open to endless attacks, owing to its numerous mutually contradictory hypotheses, each one as scientific, in appearance, as the other. On the other hand, the Substantialists, who rank, as they boast, among their numbers some of the most eminent men of Science in the United States, have undeniably discovered and accumulated a vast store of facts calculated to upset the modern theories on Force and Matter. And once that their data are shown correct, in this conflict between (materialistic) Science and (a still more materialistic) Religion—the outcome of the forthcoming battle is not difficult to foresee: modern Science will be floored. The Substantiality of certain Forces of Nature cannot be denied—for it is a fact in Kosmos. No Energy or Force without Matter, no Matter without Force, Energy or *Life*—however latent. But this *ultimate* Matter is—Substance or the *Noumenon* of matter. Thus, the head of the golden Idol of scientific truth will fall, because it stands on feet of clay. Such a result would not be anything to be regretted, except for its immediate consequences: the golden Head will remain the same, only its pedestal will be replaced by one as weak and as much of *clay* as ever. Instead of resting on Materialism, science will rest on anthropomorphic superstition—if the Substantialists ever gain the day. For, instead of holding to philosophy alone, pursued in a spirit of absolute impartiality, both materialists and adherents of what is so pompously called the "Philosophy of Substantialism" work on lines traced by preconception and with a prejudged object; and both stretch their facts on Procrustean beds of their respective hobbies. It is *facts* that have to fit their theories, even at the risk of mutilating the immaculate nature of Truth.

Before presenting the reader with extracts from the work of a Substantialist—those extracts showing better than would any critical review, the true nature of the claims of "The Substantial Philosophy"—we mean to go no further, as we are really very little concerned with them, and intend to waste no words over their flaws and pretensions. Nevertheless, as their ideas on the nature of physical Forces and phenomena are curiously—*in some respects only*—like the occult doctrines. our intention is to utilize their arguments—on Magnetism, to begin with. These are *unanswerable,* and we may thus defeat exact science by its own methods of observation and weapons. So far, we are only acquainted with the theories of the Substantialists by their writings. It is possible that, save the wide divergence between our views on the *nature* of the "phenonema-producing causes"—as they queerly call physical forces—there is but little difference in our opinions with regard to the substantial nature of Light, Heat, Electricity, Magnetism, etc., etc., perhaps only one in the form and terms used. No Theosophist, however, would agree to such expressions as are used in the New Doctrine: *e. g.*, "If its principles be true, then every force or form of Energy known to science *must be a substantial Entity.*" For although Dr. Hall's proofs with regard to magnetic fluid being something more than "a

mode of motion" are *irrefutable,* still there are other "forces" which are of quite a different nature. As this paper, however, is devoted to prove the substantiality of magnetism—whether animal or physical—we will now quote from the *Scientific Arena* (July, 1886) the best arguments that have ever appeared against the materialistic theory of modern Science.

"To admit for one moment that a single force of nature, such as *sound, light,* or *heat,* is but the vibratory motion of matter, whether that material body be highly attenuated as in the case of the supposed *ether,* less attenuated as in the case of air, or solid as in the case of a heated bar of iron, is to give away to the rank claims of materialism the entire analogy of nature and science in favour of a future life for humanity. And well do the materialistic scientists of this country and Europe know it. And to the same extent do they fear the spread and general acceptance of the Substantial Philosophy, knowing full well that the moment the forces of nature shall be recognised and taught by the schools as real substantial entities, and as soon as the mode-of-motion doctrines of sound, light, heat, etc., shall be abandoned, that soon will their materialistic occupation have gone forever. . . . .

"Hence, it is the aim of this present paper, after thus reiterating and enforcing the general scope of the argument as presented last month, to demonstrate force, *per se,* to be an immaterial substance and in no sense a motion of material particles. In this way we purpose to show the absolute necessity for Christian scientists everywhere adopting the broad principles of the Substantial Philosophy, and doing it at once, if they hope to break down materialistic atheism in this land or logically to defend religion by scientific analogy, and thus prove the substantial existence of God as well as the probable substantial existence of the human soul after death. This they now have the privilege of doing successfully, and of thus triumphantly re-enforcing their scriptural arguments by the concurrent testimony of nature herself.

"We could select any one of several of the physical forms of force as the crucial test of the new philosophy, or as the touchstone of Substantialism. But to save circumlocution and detail of unnecessary explanation as much as possible, in this leading and paramount demonstration, we select what no scientist on earth will question as a representative natural force or so-called form of energy—namely, *magnetism.* This force, from the very simple and direct manifestation of its phenomena in displacing ponderable bodies at a distance from the magnet, and without having any tangible substance connecting the magnet therewith, is selected for our purpose, since it has well proved the champion physical puzzle to modern mode-of-motion philosophers, both in this country and in Europe.

"Even to the greatest living physicists, such as Helmholtz, Tyndall, Sir William Thomson, and others, the mysterious action of magnetism, under any light which modern science can shed upon it,

admittedly affords a problem which has proved to be completely bewildering to their intellects, simply because they have, unfortunately, never caught a glimpse of the basic principles of the Substantial Philosophy which so clearly unravels the mystery. In the light of these principles such a thinker as Sir William Thomson, instead of teaching, as he did in his opening address on the five senses before the Midland Institute, at Birmingham, England, that magnetism was but the molecular motion, or as he expressed it, but the 'quality of matter' or the 'rotation of the molecules' of the magnet, would have seen at a glance the utter want of any relation, as cause to effect, between such moving molecules in the magnet (provided they do move), and the lifting of the mass of iron at a distance.

"It is passing strange that men so intelligent as Sir William Thomson and Professor Tyndall had not long ago reached the conclusion that magnetism must of necessity be a substantial thing, however invisible or intangible, when it thus stretches out its mechanical but invisible fingers to a distance from the magnet and pulls or pushes an inert piece of metal! That they have not seen the absolute necessity for such a conclusion, as the only conceivable explanation of the mechanical effects produced, and the manifest inconsistency of any other supposition, is one of the astounding results of the confusing and blinding influence of the present false theories of science upon otherwise logical and profound intellects. And that such men could be satisfied in supposing that the minute and local vibrations of the molecules and atoms of the magnet (necessarily limited to the dimensions of the steel itself) could by any possibility reach out to a distance beyond it and thus pull or push a bar of metal, overcoming its inertia, tempts one to lose all respect for the sagacity and profundity of the intellects of these great names in science. At all events, such manifest want of perspicacity in modern physicists appeals in a warning voice of thunder tones to rising young men of this country and Europe to think for themselves in matters pertaining to science and philosophy, and to accept nothing on trust simply because it happens to be set forth or approved by some great name.

"Another most remarkable anomaly in the case of the physicists to whom we have here referred is this: while failing to see the unavoidable necessity of an actual substance of some kind going forth from the poles of the magnet and connecting with the piece of iron by which to lift it and thus accomplish a physical result, that could have been effected in no other way, they are quick to accept the agency of an all-pervading *ether* (a substance not needed at all in nature) by which to produce *light* on this earth as mere *motion*, and thus make it conform to the supposed sound-waves in the air! In this way, by the sheer invention of a not-needed material substance, they have sought to convert not only light, heat, and magnetism, but all the other forces of nature into modes of motion,

and for no reason except that sound had been mistaken as a mode of motion by previous scientists. And strange to state, notwithstanding this supposed *ether* is as intangible to any of our senses, and just as unrecognised by any process known to chemistry or mechanics as is the substance which of necessity must pass out from the poles of the magnet to seize and lift the bar of iron, yet physicists cheerfully accept the former, for which no scientific necessity on earth or in heaven exists, while they stolidly refuse to recognise the latter, though absolutely needed to accomplish the results observed! Was ever such inconsistency before witnessed in a scientific theory?

"Let us scrutinize this matter a little further before leaving it. If the mere 'rotation of molecules' in the steel magnet can produce a mechanical effect on a piece of iron at a distance, even through a vacuum, as Sir William Thomson asserts, why may not the rotation of the molecules of the sun cause light at a distance without the intervening space being filled up with a jelly-like material substance, of 'enormous rigidity,' to be thrown into waves? It must strike every mind capable of thinking scientifically that the original invention of an all-pervading 'material,' 'rigid,' and 'inert' ether, as the essential cause of light at a distance from a luminous body, was one of the most useless expenditures of mechanical ingenuity which the human brain ever perpetrated—that is, if there is the slightest truth in the teaching of Sir William Thomson that the mere 'rotation of molecules' in the magnet will lift a distant bar of iron. Why cannot the rotation of the sun's molecules just as easily produce light at a distance?

"Should it be assumed in sheer desperation by the mode-of-motion philosophers that it is the *ether* filling the space between the magnet and the piece of iron, which is thrown into vibration by the rotating molecules of the steel, and which thus lifts the distant iron, it would only be to make bad worse. If material vibration in the steel magnet, which is wholly unobservable, is communicated to the distant bar through a material substance and its vibratory motions, which are equally unobservable, is it not plain that their effects on the distant bar should be of the same mechanical character, namely, unobservable? Instead of this the iron is lifted bodily and seen plainly, and that without any observed tremor, as if done by a vibrating 'jelly' such as ether is claimed to be! Besides, such bodily lifting of a ponderable mass is utterly incongruous with mere tremor, however powerful and observable such tremor or vibration might be, according to every principle known to mechanics. Common sense ought to assure any man that mere vibration or tremor, however powerful and sensible, can pull or push nothing. It is impossible to conceive of the accomplishment of such a result except by some substantial agent reaching out from the magnet, seizing the iron, and forcibly pulling and thus displacing it. As well talk of pulling a boat to the shore without some rope or other substantial thing connecting you with the boat. Even Sir William Thomson would not

claim that the boat could be pulled by getting up a molecular vibration of the shore, or even by producing a visible tremor in the water, as Dr. Hamlin so logically shewed in his recent masterly paper on *Force*. (See *Microcosm*, Vol V., p. 98).

"It is well known that a magnet will lift a piece of iron at the same distance precisely through sheets of glass as if no glass intervened. The confirmed atheist Mr. Smith, of Cincinnati, Ohio, to whom we referred in our papers on Substantialism, in *the Microcosm* (Vol. III., pages 278, 311), was utterly confounded by this exhibition of the substantial force of magnetism acting at a distance through impervious plates of glass. When we placed a quantity of needles and tacks on the plate and passed the poles of the magnet beneath it, causing them to move with the magnet, he saw for the first time in his life the operation of a real substance, exerting a mechanical effect in displacing ponderable bodies of metal in defiance of all material conditions, and with no possible material connection or free passage between the source and termination of such substantial agency. And he asked in exclamation, if this be so, may there not be a substantial, intelligent, and immaterial God, and may I not have a substantial but immaterial soul which can live separately from my body after it is dead?

"He then raised the query, asking if we were certain that it was not the invisible pores of the glass plate through which the magnetic force found its way, and therefore whether this force might not be a refined form of matter after all? He then assisted us in filling the plate with boiled water, on which to float a card with needles placed thereon, thus to interpose between them and the magnet the most imporous of all known bodies. But it made not the slightest difference, the card with its cargo of needles moving hither and thither as the magnet was moved beneath both plates and water. This was sufficient even for that most critical but candid materialist, and he confessed that there were substantial but immaterial entities in his atheistic philosophy.

"Here, then, is the conclusive argument by which we demonstrate that magnetism, one of the forces of nature, and a fair representative of all the natural forces, is not only a real, *substantial* entity, but an absolutely *immaterial* substance:* thus justifying our original classification of the entities of the universe into material and immaterial substances.

"1. If magnetism were not a real *substance*, it could not lift a piece of metal bodily at a distance from the magnet, any more than our hand could lift a weight from the floor without some substantial connection between the two. It is a self-evident truism as an axiom in mechanics, that no body can move or displace another body at a distance without a real, substantial medium connecting the two through which the result is accomplished, otherwise it would

* This is a very wrong word to use. See text.—H. P. B.

be a mechanical effect without a cause—a self-evident absurdity in philosophy. Hence, the force of magnetism is a real, substantial entity.

"2. If magnetism were not an *immaterial* substance, then any practically imporous body intervening between the magnet and the attracted object would, to some extent at least, impede the passage of the magnetic current, which it does not do. If magnetism were a very refined or attenuated form of matter, and if it thus depended for its passage through other material bodies upon their imperceptible pores then, manifestly, some difference in the freedom of its passage, and in the consequent attractive force of the distant magnet should result by great difference in the porosity of the different bodies tested, as would be the case, for example, in forcing wind through wire-netting having larger or smaller interstices, and consequently offering greater or less resistance. Whereas in the case of this magnetic substance, no difference whatever results in the energy of its mechanical pull on a distant piece of iron, however many or few of the practically imporous sheets of glass, rubber, or whatever other material body be made to intervene, or if no substance whatever but the air is interposed, or if the test be made in a perfect vacuum. The pull is always with precisely the same force, and will move the suspended piece of iron at the same distance away from it in each and every case, however refined and delicate may be the instruments by which the tests are measured."

The above quoted passages are positively unanswerable. As far as magnetic force, or fluid, is concerned the Substantialists have most undeniably made out their case; and their triumph will be hailed with joy by every Occultist. It is impossible to see, indeed, how the phenomena of magnetism—whether terrestrial or animal—can be explained otherwise than by admitting a material, or substantial magnetic fluid. This, even some of the Scientists do not deny—Helmholtz believing that electricity must be *as atomic as matter*—which *it is* (Helmholtz, "Faraday Lecture"). And, unless Science is prepared to divorce force from matter, we do not see how it can support its position much longer.

But we are not at all so sure about certain other Forces—so far as their *effects* are concerned—and Esoteric philosophy would find an easy objection to every assumption of the Substantialists—*e. g.*, with regard to sound. As the day is dawning when the new theory is sure to array itself against Occultism, it is as well, perhaps, to anticipate the objections and dispose of them at once.

The expression "immaterial Substance" used above in connection with *magnetism* is a very strange one, and moreover, it is self-contradictory. If, instead of saying that "magnetism . . . . . is not only a real substantial *entity* but an *absolutely immaterial substance*," the writer should have applied this definition to light, sound or any other force in its effects, we would have nothing to say, except to remark that the adjective "supersensuous" would

have been more applicable to any force than the "immaterial."* But to say this of the magnetic fluid is wrong, as it is an essence which is quite perceptible to any clairvoyant, whether in darkness—as in the case of *odic* emanations—or in light—when animal magnetism is practised. Being then a *fluid* in a supersensuous state, still *matter,* it cannot be "immaterial," and the expression becomes at once as illogical as it is sophistical. With regard to the other *forces*—if by "immaterial" is meant only that which is objective, but beyond the range of our present *normal* perceptions or senses, well and good; but then whatever Substantialists may mean by it, we Occultists and Theosophists demur to the form in which they put it. Substance, we are told in philosophical dictionaries and encyclopedias, is that which *underlies* outward phenomena; substratum; the permanent subject or cause of phenomena, whether material or spiritual; that in which properties inhere; that which is real in distinction from that which is only *apparent*—especially in this world of *maya.* It is in short—*real,* and the one real Essence. But the Occult sciences, while calling Substance the *noumenon* of every material form, explain that *noumenon* as being *still matter*—only on another plane. That which is *noumenon* to our human perceptions is matter to those of a Dhyan Chohan. As explained by our learned Vedantin Brother —T. Subba Row—*Mulaprakriti,* the first universal aspect of Parabrahma, its Kosmic Veil, and whose essence, to us, is unthinkable, is to the LOGOS "as material as any object is material to us" *(Notes on Bhag. Gita.).* Hence—no Occultist would describe Substance as "immaterial" in *esse.*

Substance is a confusing term, in any case. We may call our body, or an ape, or a stone, as well as any kind of fabric—"substantial." Therefore, we call "Essence" rather, the material of the bodies of those Entities—the supersensous Beings, in whom we believe, and who do exist, but whom Science and its admirers regard as superstitious nonsense, calling *fictions* alike a "personal" god and the angels of the Christians, as they would our Dhyan Chohans, or the Devas, "Planetary Men," Genii, etc., etc., of the Kabalists and Occultists. But the latter would never dream of calling the phenomena of Light, Sound, Heat, Cohesion, etc.—*"Entities,"* as the Substantialists do. They would define those Forces as purely *immaterial* perceptive effects—*without,* of substantial and *essential* CAUSES —within: at the ultimate end of which, or at the origin, stands an ENTITY, the essence of the latter changing with that of the Element† it belongs to. (See "Monads, Gods, and Atoms" of Volume I "Secret Doctrine," Book II.) Nor can the Soul be confused with FORCES, which are on quite another plane of perception. It shocks,

---

* The use of the terms "matter, or substance existing in *supersenuous* conditions" or, "supersensuous states of matter" would avoid an outburst of fierce but just criticism not only from men of Science, but from any ordinary well educated man who knows the value of terms.

† Useless to remind again the reader, that by Elements it is not the *compound* air, water and earth, that exist present to our terrestrial and sensuous perceptions that are meant—but the *noumenal* Elements of the ancients.

therefore, a Theosophist to find the Substantialists so *unphilosophically* including Soul among the Forces.

Having—as he tells his readers—"laid the foundation of our argument in the clearly defined analogies of Nature," the editor of the *Scientific Arena*, in an article called "The Scientific Evidence of a Future Life," proceeds as follows:—

"If the principles of Substantialism be true, then, as there shown, every force or form of energy known to science must be a substantial entity. We further endeavoured to show that if one form of force were conclusively demonstrated to be a substantial or objective existence, it would be a clear departure from reason and consistency, not to assume all the forces or phenomena-producing causes in nature also to be substantial entities. But if one form of physical force, or one single phenomenon-producing cause, such as heat, light, or sound, could be clearly shown to be the mere *motion* of material particles, and not a substantial entity or thing, then by rational analogy and the harmonious uniformity of nature's laws, all the other forces or phenomena-producing causes, whether physical, vital, mental or spiritual, must come within the same category as non-entitative *modes of motion* of material particles. Hence it would follow in such case, that the soul, life, mind, or spirit, so far from being a substantial entity which can form the basis of a hope for an immortal existence beyond the present life, must, according to materialism, and as the mere *motion* of brain and nerve particles, cease to exist whenever such physical particles shall cease to move at death."

Spirit—a "substantial Entity"!! Surely Substantialism cannot pretend very seriously to the title of *philosophy*—in such case. But let us read the arguments to the end. Here we find a just and righteous attack on Materialism wound up with the same unphilosophical assertion! . . . .

"From the foregoing statement of the salient positions of materialistic science, as they bear against the existence of the soul after death, we drew the logical conclusion that no Christian philosopher who accepts the current doctrines of sound, light and heat as but *modes of molecular motion*, can ever answer the analogical reasoning of the materialist against the immortality of man. No possible view, as we have so often insisted, can make the least headway against such materialistic reasoning or frame any reply to this great argument of Haeckel and Huxley against the soul as an entity and its possible existence separate from the body, save the teaching of Substantialism, which so consistently maintains that the soul, life, mind and spirit are necessarily substantial forces or entities from the analogies of physical science, namely, *the substantial nature of all the physical forces, including gravity, electricity, magnetism, cohesion, sound, light, heat, etc.*

"This impregnable position of the Substantialist from logical analogy, based on the harmonious uniformity of nature's laws and

forces, forms the bulwark of the Substantial Philosophy, and must in the nature of things for ever constitute the strong tower of that system of teaching. If the edifice of Substantialism, thus founded and fortified, can be taken and sacked by the forces of Materialism, then our labours for so many years have manifestly come to naught. Say, if you please, that the armies of Substantialism are thus burning the bridges behind them. So be it. We prefer death to either surrender or retreat; for if this fundamental position cannot be maintained against the combined forces of the enemy, then all is lost, Materialism has gained the day, and death is the eternal annihilation of the human race. Within this central citadel of principles, therefore, we have intrenched ourselves to survive or perish, and here, encircled by this wall of adamant, we have stored all our treasures and munitions of war, and if the agnostic hordes of materialistic science wish to possess them, let them train upon it their heaviest artillery . . . .

"How strange, then, when materialists themselves recognize the desperateness of their situation, and so readily grasp the true bearing of this analogical argument based on the substantial nature of the physical forces, that we should be obliged to reason with professed Substantialists, giving them argument upon argument in order to prove to them that they are no Substantialists at all, in the true sense of that term, so long as they leave one single force of nature or one single phenomenon-producing cause in nature, out of the category of substantial entities!

"One minister of our acquaintance speaks glowingly of the ultimate success of the Substantial Philosophy, and proudly calls himself a Substantialist, but refuses to include sound among the substantial forces and entities, thus virtually accepting the wave-theory! In the name of all logical consistency, what could that minister say in reply to another 'Substantialist' who would insist upon the beauty and truth of Substantialism, but who could not include *Light?* And then another who could not include *heat,* or *electricity,* or *magnetism,* or *gravity?* Yet all of them good *'Substantialists'* on the very same principle as is the one who leaves *sound* out of the substantial category, while still claiming to be an orthodox Substantialist! Why should they not leave life-force and mind-force and spirit-force out of the list of entities, thus making them, like sound-force (as materialists insist), but the vibration of material particles, and still claim the right to call themselves good Substantialists? Haeckel and Huxley would then be duly qualified candidates for baptism into the church of Substantialism.

"The truth is, the minister who can admit for one moment that *sound* consists of but the motion of air-particles, and thus, that it is not a substantial entity, is a materialist at bottom, though he may not be conscious of the logical maelstrom that is whirling him to scientific destruction. We have all heard of the play of 'Hamlet,' with the Prince of Denmark left out. Such would be the scientific

play of Substantialism with the sound question ignored, and the theory of acoustics handed over to Materialism. (See our editorial on 'The Meaning of the Sound Discussion,' *The Microcosm,* Vol. V., p. 197.)"

We sympathize with the "Minister" who refuses to include *Sound* among "Substantial *Entities.*" We believe in FOHAT, but would hardly refer to his *Voice* and Emanations as "Entities," though they are produced by an electric shock of atoms and repercussions producing *both Sound and Light.* Science would accept no more our Fohat than the Sound or Light-*Entities* of the "Substantial Philosophy" (?). But we have this satisfaction, at any rate, that, once thoroughly explained, Fohat will prove more philosophical than either the materialistic or substantial theories of the forces of nature.

How can anyone with pretensions to both a *scientific* and *psychological* mind, speaking of *Soul* and especially of Spirit, place them on the same level as the physical phenomena of nature, and this, in a language one can apply *only* to physical facts! Even Professor Bain, "a monistic ANNIHILATIONIST," as he is called, confesses that "mental and bodily states are utterly contrasted."*

Thus, the direct conclusion the Occultists and the Theosophists can come to at any rate on the *prima facie* evidence furnished them by writings which no philosophy can now rebut, is—that Substantial Philosophy, which was brought forth into this world to fight materialistic science and to slay it, surpasses it immeasurably in Materialism. No Bain, no Huxley, nor even Haeckel, has ever confused to this degree mental and physical phenomena. At the same time the "apostles of Materialism" are on a higher plane of philosophy than their opponents. For, the charge preferred against them of teaching that Soul is "the mere motion of brain and nerve particles" is untrue, for they never did so teach. But, even supposing such would be their theory, it would only be in accordance with Substantialism, since the latter assures us that Soul and *Spirit,* as much as all "the *phenomena-producing causes,*" (?) whether physical, mental, or spiritual—if not regarded as SUBSTANTIAL ENTITIES —"must come within the same category as *non-entitative* (?) *modes of motion* of material particles."

All this is not only painfully vague, but is almost meaningless. The inference that the acceptance of the received scientific theories on light, sound and heat, etc., would be equivalent to accepting *the soul motion of molecules*—is certainly hardly worth discussion. It is quite true that some thirty or forty years ago Büchner and Moleschott attempted to prove that sensation and thought are a movement of matter. But this has been pronounced by a well-known English *Annihilationist* "unworthy of the name of 'philosophy'."

---

* The Substantialists call, moreover, *Spirit* that which we call Mind—(*Manas*), and thus it is Soul which takes with them the place of ATMA; in short they confuse the vehicle with the *Driver* inside.

Not one man of real scientific reputation or of any eminence, not Tyndall, Huxley, Maudsley, Clifford, Bain, Spencer nor Lewis, in England, nor Virchow, nor Haeckel in Germany, has ever gone so far as to say:—"Thought IS a motion of molecules." Their only quarrel with the believers in a soul was and is, that while the latter maintain that soul is the *cause* of thought, they (the Scientists) assert that thought is the *concomitant* of certain physical processes in the brain. Nor have they ever said (the *real* scientists and philosophers, however materialistic) that thought and nervous motion *are the same,* but that they are "the subjective and objective sides of the same thing."

John Stuart Mill is a good authority and an example to quote, and thus deny the charge. For, speaking of the rough and rude method of attempting to resolve sensation into nervous motion (taking as his example the case of the *nerve-vibrations* to the brain which are the physical side of the *light* perception), "at the end of all these motions, there is something which is *not motion*—there *is a feeling or sensation of colour*" . . . . he says. Hence, it is quite true to say, that "the *subjective feeling* here spoken of by Mill will outlive even the acceptance of the undulatory theory of light, or heat, as a mode of motion." For the latter is based on a *physical speculation* and the former is built on everlasting *philosophy* —however imperfect, because so tainted with Materialism.

Our quarrel with the Materialists is not so much for their *soulless Forces,* as for their denying the existence of any "Force-bearer," the Noumenon of Light, Electricity, etc. To accuse them of not making a difference between mental and physical phenomena is equal to proclaiming oneself ignorant of their theories. The most famous *Negationists* are to-day the first to admit that SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS and MOTION "are at the opposite poles of existence." That which remains to be settled between us and the *materialistic* IDEALISTS—a living paradox by the way, now personified by the most eminent writers on *Idealistic* philosophy in England—is the question whether that consciousness is only experienced in connection with organic molecules of the brain or not. We say it is the thought or mind which sets the molecules of the physical brain in motion; they deny any existence to mind, independent of the brain. But even *they* do not call the seat of the mind "a molecular fabric," but only that it is "the *mind-principle*"—the seat or the organic basis of the manifesting mind. That such is the real attitude of materialistic science may be demonstrated by reminding the reader of Mr. Tyndall's confessions in his *Fragments of Science,* for since the days of his discussions with Dr. Martineau, the attitude of the Materialists has not changed. This attitude remains unaltered, unless, indeed, we place the *Hylo-Idealists* on the same level as Mr. Tyndall—which would be absurd. Treating of the phenomenon of Consciousness, the great physicist quotes this question from Mr. Martineau: "A man can say 'I feel, I think, I love'; but how does consciousness

infuse itself into the problem?" And he thus answers: "The passage from the physics of the brain to the corresponding facts of consciousness is unthinkable. Granted that a definite thought and a molecular action in the brain occur simultaneously; we do not possess the intellectual organ, nor apparently any rudiments of the organ, which would enable us to pass by a process of reasoning from one to the other. They appear together, but *we do not know why*. Were our minds and senses so expanded, strengthened and illuminated, as to enable us to see and feel the very molecules of the brain; *were we capable* of following all their motions, all their groupings, all their electric discharges, if such there be; and were we intimately acquainted with the corresponding states of thought and feeling, we should be as far as ever from the solution of the problem, 'How are these physical processes connected with the facts of consciousness?' The chasm between the two classes of phenomena would still remain intellectually impassable."

Thus, there appears to be far less disagreement between the Occultists and modern Science than between the former and the Substantialists. The latter confuse most hopelessly the subjective with the objective phases of all phenomena, and the Scientists do not, notwithstanding that they limit the *subjective* to the earthly or terrestrial phenomena only. In this they have chosen the Cartesian method with regard to atoms and molecules; we hold to the ancient and primitive philosophical beliefs, so intuitively perceived by Leibnitz. Our system can thus be called, as his was—"Spiritualistic and Atomistic."

Substantialists speak with great scorn of the vibratory theory of science. But, until able to *prove* that their views would explain the phenomena as well, filling, moreover the actual gaps and flaws in the modern hypotheses, they have hardly the right to use such a tone. As all such theories and speculations are only provisional, we may well leave them alone. Science has made wonderful discoveries on the objective side of all the physical phenomena. Where it is really wrong is, when it perceives in matter *alone—i. e.*, in that matter which is known to it—the *alpha* and the *omega* of all phenomena. To reject the scientific theory, however, of vibrations in light and sound, is to court as much ridicule as the scientists do in rejecting *physical* and *objective* spiritualistic phenomena by attributing them all to fraud. Science has ascertained and *proved* the exact rapidity with which the sound-waves travel, and it has artificially imitated—on the data of transmission of sound by those waves—the human voice and other acoustic phenomena. The *sensation* of sound —the response of the sensory tract to an *objective* stimulus (atmospheric vibrations) is an affair of consciousness: and to call sound an "Entity" on *this* plane, is to *objectivate* most ridiculously a *subjective* phenomenon which is but an effect after all—the lower end of a concatenation of causes. If Materialism locates all in objective matter and fails to see the origin and primary causes of

the Forces—so much the worse for the materialists; for it only shows the limitations of their own capacities of hearing and seeing—limitations which Huxley, for one, recognizes, for he is unable on his own confession to define the boundaries of our senses, and still asserts his materialistic tendency by locating sounds only in cells of matter, and on our sensuous plane. Behold, the great Biologist dwarfing our senses and curtailing the powers of man and nature in his usual ultra-poetical language. Hear him (as quoted by Sterling "Concerning Protoplasm") speak of "the wonderful noonday silence of a tropical forest," which *"is after all due only to the dullness of our hearing,* and could our ears only catch the murmurs of these tiny maelstroms as they whirl in the innumerable myriads of living cells which constitute each tree, we should be stunned as with the roar of a great city."

The telephone and the phonograph, moreover, are there to upset any theory except the vibratory one—however *materialistically* expressed. Hence, the attempt of the Substantialists "to show the fallacy of the wave-theory of sound as universally taught, and to outline the substantial theory of acoustics," cannot be successful. If they shew that sound is not *a mode of motion in its origin* and that the forces are not merely the qualities and property of matter induced or generated *in, by* and *through* matter, under certain conditions—they will have achieved a great triumph. But, whether as substance, matter or effect, sound and light can never be divorced from their modes of manifesting through *vibrations*—as the whole subjective or occult nature is one everlasting perpetual motion of VORTICAL *vibrations.*

H. P. B.

WHAT IS MEANT BY "SOUL"?*

What is precisely meant by Soul *in Theosophical literature? We say the "Soul of man," the "Soul of the world," the "Soul of things."*

W. Q. Judge.—Theosophical literature has not as yet come to a *precise* meaning for "soul," nor can it until the English language has been so altered as to remove the confusion now existing among such terms as "soul" and "spirit," and in the uses to which both are put. So long as we have in fact but two terms, *soul* and *spirit,* to designate so many beings, kinds of beings and powers as those are used for, just so long will there be confusion.

---

* This answer by Mr. Judge to the question asked was first printed in *The Theosophical Forum* of May, 1895. The title used is our own.—[ED. THEOSOPHY.]

SOME TEACHINGS OF A GERMAN MYSTIC*

III.

THE CAPTAIN'S DOUBLE

[*From the German of J. Kernning.*]

A CERTAIN Captain von Härdteck, of the sixth regiment of the line, at P * * rch * had a remarkable experience. His parents sent him to the military academy, although he had shown no special inclination for an army career. Nevertheless he adapted himself very well to his calling. He was diligent, was scrupulously attentive to his duties, and on entering active service he was particularly favored, so that his promotion was hastened. He soon became a captain, and then for the first time he began to reflect upon the conditions of his profession. "It is difficult," he once said to himself, "to unite the true man with the soldier, inasmuch as the latter, too severely bound to forms, very easily loses himself in them and holds them for the essential. But even when the forms are strict, the heart must be yielding and humane if one is not to oppose himself to the first law of human nature."

Amid such reflections, and with the most scrupulous attention to his duties, he had passed three years as captain, when he began to feel a strange sensation internally and upon his head.

"What is that?" he thought; "are my broodings injuring my health or confusing my understanding?" He examined himself closely, but found nothing that could cause concern. One evening when alone in his room he seemed to feel a presence at his side. He looked, but that which he thought to see turned backwards as he turned. He looked straight forward again and behold, at his side there stood a figure which, with some exertion, by turning only his eyes and not his head, he recognized as the image of himself!

He could not repress an involuntary shudder and he fled from the chamber to rid himself of his strange companion. Outside the house, he saw the figure no more but he continually seemed to feel its presence. "What shall come of this?" he thought; "I am not a Sunday child that sees ghosts!"

The next day, at the same hour, the apparition came again, but this time much plainer than before. When he sat down, it sat beside him; when he paced the room it accompanied him; and when he stood still it stood still also.

"This is no illusion!" he cried, "for I am conscious of everything else. What shall I do? In whom confide? nobody will believe me; they would even ridicule me. I must keep my own counsel and, though the case is a strange one, can do nothing more than meet it with manly courage."

---

* This article was first printed by William Q. Judge in *The Path* for October, 1887.

Captain von Härdteck had long been betrothed to Fräulein von Blum but could not obtain permission to marry. He had sent a third petition to the ministry of war and was daily looking for an answer. Three days afterwards the colonel of his regiment came to him at dress parade and congratulated him on his speedy marriage. "The permission of the King," said he, "has arrived! in an hour, at the furthest, you will receive it and all the hindrances that stood in your way will be removed."

In his strange situation this news did not cause him such joy as it formerly would have done, for it was his duty to inform his betrothed of his peculiar condition, and he was doubtful how it would be received. "Heretofore," he thought, "my happiness has been delayed by earthly circumstances; and now heaven, or at least a spiritual being, comes in my way." With faint heart he set out to see his beloved one. What he feared, happened; she was horrified to learn of his ghostly companion and begged for time to reflect and consult her parents. Härdteck parted from her in sorrow and said, "My heart loves sincerely and were you in my place I would not hesitate; I will not complain, however, but will hope that your heart will conquer fear."

He passed two anxious days in uncertainty. On the third he received from the father of his beloved a letter which said that under the circumstances the proposed marriage could not take place. He was sorry to give an honorable man such an answer, but his love for his daughter compelled him to; he would count upon the uprightness of the captain and hoped their friendly relations would not be broken off.

Härdteck read the letter with silent resignation and said at last: "It is not my destiny to be happy; I must bear this loss, heavy though it be."

The King's permission and the intended marriage were generally known and everybody wondered that the affair should come to an end at the moment of fulfillment. The officers of the regiment took it as an insult to their comrade and demanded satisfaction of the young lady's father. The colonel himself summoned the captain and questioned him about the matter. Härdteck declared that he alone was to blame; something had happened to him which he could not disclose. The colonel begged him to give him some kind of a reason in order to pacify the other officers. After a struggle with himself the captain confessed that for some time a ghost had been at his side and refused to leave him. The young lady, when informed of this extraordinary circumstance, could not master her fear and therefore the engagement had been broken off.

The colonel gazed in astonishment. "Ghost? nonsense!" he exclaimed. "That is a notion which you have hatched out in your lonesome life, and it will disappear of itself as soon as you have a wife. The young lady is a fool and her head will have to be set right."

Härdteck defended her and begged the colonel to attempt nothing that might offend or compromise her. The colonel consented at last, but said, "You must be helped. Ask the doctor for advice; perhaps he knows some way to banish your unbidden companion."

The captain, although he felt convinced that medical skill would avail nothing in this case, followed the colonel's advice and spent half a year in trying useless medicines. Then he refused further physical remedies and declared that he regarded his condition as fated; he would have to bear it until it changed of itself.

The colonel said, "Well, do as you wish; but I will make one more attempt myself. When I lived in the capital," he continued, "I once met a man who, without the least boastfulness and in all seriousness stated that he had attained the gift of knowing all things; he therefore asked all those who found that human wisdom would not avail in unusual matters to turn to him for the advice or help which he could give. I will write to him, and if his words were not mere nothings perhaps he can help us."

He wrote the same day. Shortly he received this answer:

"The condition of your friend, which you have described, is a peculiar one. It originates in a too great conscientiousness, in that the captain doubts that the better nature of man can be joined to the life of a soldier. In consequence of this conflict two beings have been developed within him; one a soldier and the other an ordinary human being; these two would like to become one, but the indecision of the person prevents them. Greet your friend in my name and tell him he should befriend himself more with his ghostly companion and endeavor to become one with him in order that the latter may become absorbed in and make a completed man of him. Then he will see that true human worth excludes no calling and confines itself to no garb, but manifests itself where the inner life releases itself from the external and gives to the latter the laws of thought and action. If your friend takes the contents of this letter to heart and carries them into practice, it will be well for him from time to time to give me news of how it stands with him, so that in case he should go astray I can set him right again."

This letter made a great impression upon the captain and he exclaimed: "He speaks of an inner life! Is not the apparition which has come to me perhaps the beginning of that? I will follow his advice and see what comes of it."

Härdteck kept his promise. The figure which for a long time had kept at his side at last changed its position and appeared before him, turned itself around with the circle of his thoughts and gradually began to think and to speak within him.

"Man is a wondrous creature," he said to himself; "spiritual and divine is his nature when his inner life awakens; but dead without this, however much of acquired theories he may have taken up. I perceive that now I am on the way to truth, and my first duty is to thank my friend and the teacher whom I found through him."

AROUND THE TABLE

IT is seldom that the Family meets as a whole before dinner time. In fact it is considered a lucky night indeed when at least one chair is not vacant at that sacred evening meal. But this particular afternoon was unusual in many ways. Spinster's tea table, in service at a little function earlier in the afternoon, was still working at five o'clock, after her guests had left; Doctor was unaccountably present and had brought Student home with him in his car; Mother and Mentor were quietly discussing some matter of their own, over their fragrant cups—and who should stalk in about five-thirty but Big Brother, throwing down his coat in the hall as he swung into the quiet living room.

"Storm signals set," remarked Student, nudging the Doctor, as Big Brother strode into the room.

"Just in time for a cup of tea," exclaimed Spinster. "Now be careful as you can, Cyclone dear, or you'll break the pretty cup."

"Don't *want* any tea," growled Big Brother, taking the cup nevertheless and stirring its none too warm contents absently with his forefinger, "never drink it—just as soon drink soapy water. What's all the fuss over, Spinster, been having the Ladies' Aid Society?"

"Nonsense, you old growler," answered Spinster, with that ingratiating little smile of hers that would cause Jove himself to relax, and to which Big Brother responded with a sigh of relaxation, as he sank into a chair. "What's Dick been doing now to make you cross?" Spinster continued. Dick is Big Brother's law partner and quite often they seem to clash.

Big Brother's relaxation was gone in an instant. "I won't stand it—imposing on that youngster! Dick's got to stop!" Tea-cup and saucer came down with a bang that threatened their safety.

"Whoa Emma!" said Student slangily.

"Easy there, Boy," said the Doctor. "If there's going to be an explosion in *this* house, I'll attend to it myself."

Mother looked at Doctor in grieved surprise, just as she always does if he seems to criticise her son, and then turned to Big Brother with her soothing, "What's the trouble, Son?" That always brings out the story, and incidentally restores peace to troubled household waters.

"Well, I'll leave it to Mentor to judge," said Big Brother, aggrievedly. "Dick is studying some new psychological or will-power stuff, and practising 'suggestion' on the office-boy. I told him just exactly what I thought about it tonight," Big Brother's voice rose aggressively, "and he said he'd do just as *he* thought best, slammed down his desk and left—just like that!"

"Well, I hope you didn't use *that* tone of voice to Dick," said Mentor quietly. "Opposition merely begets opposition, you know.

Why not talk with Dick *quietly* about it? But just what has he been doing, and what does 'suggestion' mean?"

Big Brother had the grace to look ashamed, and the decency to say he felt so. "I'm sorry for the explosion, and I apologize, Doctor," he said, looking at his Father, and then to Mentor.

"Why, I got thinking madder and madder all the way home—that's the way explosions come, isn't it? But about this 'suggestion' business," he continued, "it's sort of an experimental 'efficiency' idea Dick is carried away with—to make somebody do something for you without your speaking to him at all. And Dick is calling the office boy without even looking at him. Somehow I don't think it is right to the youngster. Why, first thing you know Dick will be trying it out on me! He already has attempted to use it in Court, and nearly got into a fight with opposing counsel. The fellow said Dick was trying to hypnotize a witness. Perhaps he was right," added Big Brother thoughtfully.

"Well it *was* something like that," agreed Mentor. "And for Dick, with his superficial information, to be trying it is something like a child playing with dynamite. We'll have to talk with *that* young man. So they call it 'Suggestion' nowadays," he continued musingly. "A few centuries ago it had another name—one we'd laugh at now: they used to call it 'Black Magic'!"

Doctor suddenly showed deep interest. "But what does the Boy do, Son? How does it affect *him?*" he asked.

Big Brother thought for a moment. "Why he just *wriggled* at first, Doctor; but now he comes when Dick wants him. Looked kind of scared at first, it seems to me—and as if he'd been crying. I didn't notice much; thought he had a cold, I guess."

It was Doctor's turn to explode this time, and he did so with a vengeance. "Silly donkey! I'll drop in tomorrow, see the boy, and give your fine Dick a piece of my mind!"

Big Brother started to defend his Partner with a "Dick *means* all right," but Doctor was off and going strong, and Mentor motioned to the Big One to say no more.

"Case just like it I'm treating now," declared the Doctor. "Fine young girl, delicate and well-bred, stenographer in lawyer's office—he's a great big beefy fellow, fine animal, lots of force. Her mother sent for me without the daughter's knowing it; seemed that the girl cried a good deal and was afraid to go to work. She thought people in the street cars were trying to 'influence' her, and acted more and more strangely all the time. This had been going on for some time when I first saw her. I gave her a tonic; got her to coming to the office. It was weeks before I really gained her confidence and, Mentor," the Doctor turned to him, "that girl was getting weaker and whiter and *coarser*, all the time!"

Doctor paused, picked up his cup and looked at it disinterestedly for a moment, and then set it down again. "Well, I got her

story," he continued. "This big, clever, animalistic fellow was interested in 'Psycho-Analysis', or some similar stuff—never mind the name. He began just as Dick is beginning with his office boy—to call this young stenographer without speaking to her. Then it went on to silent dictation, and then to actual hypnosis—well, it was just about as bad as it could be. But do you know, I don't think that lawyer had any bad intentions at all in the first place? It was just an interesting experiment with him; but it got so 'easy,' as he himself confessed to me, that it was just like sliding down hill."

There was an uncomfortable silence in the room. Mother broke it at last. "What became of her, Doctor?"

"She's in a private asylum," he answered soberly. "He is paying the bills—Oh, I saw to that, you may be sure. He will marry her, if she ever gets well, he thinks. But, between us, if she ever *does* get well, I think she'll never *have* him, because *then* she'll fully understand. And that will add another tragedy, because now he has 'spoiled' her, the man himself loves her."

Student was openly wiping her eyes, when the Doctor finished speaking. Spinster, deep in thought, crumbled a bit of cake in her dainty fingers. "I wonder what Friend Dick would think of *that* story," she said at last, breaking her train of thought with a little shudder.

"Well, you were right, my Son," remarked Mother fondly, looking at Big Brother, "when you scolded Dick."

"Right in substance, but wrong in method," said Mentor. "Tell me, Boy, what made you think Dick was wrong; what was your own idea in the matter—can you formulate it?"

Big Brother turned to Mentor thoughtfully, and a puzzled frown came over his frank, kind face. "Why I don't know, Mentor," he said at last. "Dick talked about his theories, but I didn't pay any particular attention. When I got to noticing what he was really doing, I guess I pitied the boy—just as you pity anyone who is being overpowered by a stronger person. But there was something further," he added musingly, "it was a feeling, perhaps—I just *felt* that something wrong was going on."

"Exactly what I thought," said Mentor, smiling. "And feeling is often a true guide to right conduct. *True* feeling is really the highest intellection. We call it 'intuition', you know. It's actually the acquired knowledge of the Soul, through the long experience of many incarnations. Now Dick might have got something *real* from you, if your manner had been different when you talked with him about the matter. But there was some excuse for the violence of your protest—or rather some *reason* for it," Mentor hastened to add warningly. "You see we have all been through many conditions and many civilizations in our great past, and you have doubtless actually seen and felt the workings of 'suggestion', or rather, 'Black Magic' in other lives. Your *feeling*

that 'something wrong was going on', as you phrase it, was in fact the memory from within of the past experiences of yourself."

"A kind of *conscience*, wasn't it!" interrupted Big Brother.

"Well, some people call it that," answered Mentor, "and that's a good enough name, if we know what it means. What have you got, Doctor?" Mentor added, for the Doctor had gone into a brown study as he finished his story, and apparently had not heard any of the talk that had followed it.

"Why, I was thinking," said the Doctor slowly, "what a tremendous field for the exercise of right and wrong influence this 'suggestion' idea opens up. It's hypnotism, you say? Well, I guess that's the name for it."

"Yes, it's a greater or less, a partial or more full hypnosis, as the case may be," answered Mentor. "The fascination that a snake exercises over its prey is an aspect of it. The curious ascendancy of one being over another, a sort of obsession that is sometimes evident, is another. The concurrent action of a crowd of people, sometimes called 'mob-consciousness', is another aspect of the same influence, a species of self-hypnosis this time. Whenever the integrity of an individual is broken down, or overborne, there the action of undue influence of some kind or another may be seen."

"But an individual might exercise this power for good," suggested the Doctor.

"Yes," answered Mentor, "he *might;* but in the present civilization, with our present individualistic and selfish ideas, it is very questionable if the conscious exercise of such power is safe in anybody's hands. Complete unselfishness, pure motive, and accurate knowledge form the basis of its right practice. Be honest with yourself and you will realize how few, if any, there are who could be trusted at all times with the exercise of such power."

"Does the hypnotizer transfer something of his own nature to the subject then?" asked Big Brother, thoughtfully.

"Certainly," said Mentor. "Whatever there is in him of good and evil enters into the influence, and affects his subject. And as we all have the seeds of *all* good and evil in us, ready to germinate if effective conditions are provided, you can make your own deductions as to the responsibilities the one who practises hypnotism, or 'suggestion', assumes.

"It comes to this," Mentor added, "the integrity of the being cannot be violated with impunity. Now think what it means when a person causes others to think, feel or act as he would have them, *without their will*—without their even *knowing* it, as is sometimes the case! Think, too, of the incalculable harm engendered by the various 'schools of thought' which purport to teach men and women to exercise power, under one name or another, over their fellows; and think of the awful consequences that may follow the action of people who subject themselves knowingly to the influence of the many 'Healers' who try to cure diseases, physical and psychical, by the supposed 'power of mind'—or any name you will!"

"How about the 'suggestive salesmanship', with its schools?" asked Big Brother.

"It's the same sort of thing, on its own plane," answered Mentor positively. "Its object is to try to sell a man or woman something, regardless of whether that something is really needed or wanted. The result is usually brought about by arousing the victim's desire or cupidity. Of course, this would not be admitted by the 'schools', but it's a fact, nevertheless."

"Nice, sweet, brotherly idea, isn't it?" said the Doctor dryly. "Well, what's the basis of it all, Mentor; and what's the cure? Can you give us some idea of that?"

Mentor smiled and was silent a moment. Then he said: "It's not so easy, Doctor, as all that—to give your 'basis' and your 'cure'. People will take the one rather gradually, and the other will then come naturally. It's all going to require time, but the right result will surely come. The study of Theosophy will alone give the right basis," he added, looking about at the faces of the Family, all alight with interest. "And the *practice* of Theosophy will alone effect the right understanding and 'cure'.

"We are all the children of the past, as well as the present, and the many powers and tendencies gained in that past are beginning to express themselves in strange ways, as our race moves forward into new places in its evolution. In a strongly material civilization like ours where no real understanding of the purpose of life is widely held, men think of themselves as separate and so exercise these rising powers as against each other. But some men and women will step out of the ranks and move another way. Then understanding themselves, and thus understanding life itself—and all the other 'lives'—they will exercise their powers for the good of all, and add themselves to that 'Sacred Band of Heroes', from whose number have come, and will come, the 'Saviours of Humanity'. The old saying that 'a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump' is a true one. And some men will consciously choose to add their own 'leaven' to the 'little leaven', one by one, as their time comes.

"Meantime we can spread, as opportunity presents, the ideas of 'true philosophy and right conduct' which Theosophy presents; and the influence of our example—which is the only 'influence' we should seek to develop—will do its own work, a more and more perfect and powerful work as its unselfishness becomes apparent."

Spinster broke in, "Then *you'll* talk with poor Dick, won't you, Mentor? *You* go with Doctor when he makes the call."

"I'll think of it, Spinster," he answered. And then as he saw the trouble in her face, he added, "Yes, my Dear, of course, I will."

Came the soft chime of the dinner gong, unexpectedly—floating into the living room; and tea things were pushed aside, as the Family moved toward the dining room, to gather "around the table" for the evening meal.

THE MORAL LAW OF COMPENSATION*

BY AN EX-ASIATIC.[1]

"For thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field; and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee." Job, Chap. V, v. 23, Christian Bible.

AS a Western Theosophist I would like to present to my Indian brethren a few thoughts upon what I conceive to be the operation of the Law of Compensation in part, or, to put it more clearly, upon the operation of one branch of this law.

It seems undeniable that this law is the most powerful, and the one having the most numerous and complicated ramifications of all the laws with which we have to deal. This it is that makes so difficult for a human spirit the upward progress after which we all are striving, and it is often forced upon me that it is this law which perpetuates the world, with its delusions, its sadness, its illusions, and that if we could but understand it so as to avoid its operation, the *nirvana* for the whole human family would be an accomplished fact.

In a former number a respected brother from Ceylon, speaking with authority, showed us how to answer the question so often asked: "Why do we see a good man eating the bread of poverty, and the wicked dwelling in riches, and why so often is a good man cast down from prosperity to despair, and a wicked man after a period of sorrow and hardship made to experience for the balance of his life nothing but success and prosperity?" He replied that our acts in any one period of existence were like the arrow shot from the bow, acting upon us in the next life and producing our rewards and punishments. So that to accept his explanation—as we must—it is, of course, necessary to believe in re-incarnation. As far as he went, he was very satisfactory, but he did not go into the subject as thoroughly as his great knowledge would permit. It is to be hoped that he will favor us with further essays upon the same subject.

I have not yet seen anywhere stated the *rationale* of the operation of this law—how and why it acts in any particular case.

To say that the reviling of a righteous man will condemn one to a life of a beggar in the next existence is definite enough in statement, but it is put forward without a reason, and unless we accept these teachings blindly we cannot believe such consequences would follow. To appeal to our minds, there should be a reason given, which shall be at once plain and reasonable. There must be some law for this particular case; otherwise, the statement cannot be true. There must occur, from the force of the revilement, the infraction of some natural regulation, the production of some discord in the spiritual world which has for a consequence the punishment by beggary in

---

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for October, 1881.

[1] W. Q. Judge, F. T. S.

Vol. 3 - p. 15

the succedent existence of the reviler. The only other reason possible of statement is, that it is so ordered. But such a reason is not a reason at all because no Theosophist will believe that any punishment, save that which man himself inflicts, is *ordered.* As this world is a world produced by law, moved by law, and governed by the natural operation of laws which need no one to operate them, but which invariably and unerringly operate themselves, it must follow that any punishment suffered in this way is not suffered through any order, but is suffered because the natural law operates itself. And further, we are compelled to accept this view, because to believe that it was *ordered,* would infer the existence of some particular person, mind, will, or intelligence to *order* it, which for one instant no one will believe, who knows that this world was produced, and is governed, by the operation of number, weight and measure, with harmony over and above all.

So then we should know in what manner the law operates, which condemns the reviler of a righteous man to beggary in his next existence. That knowledge once gained, we may be able to find for ourselves the manner and power of placating as it were this terrible monster of compensation by performing some particular acts which shall in some way be a restoration of the harmony which we have broken, if perchance we have unconsciously or inadvertently committed the sin.

Let us now imagine a boy born of wealthy parents, but not given proper intelligence. He is, in fact, called an idiot. But instead of being a mild idiot, he possesses great malice which manifests itself in his tormenting insects and animals at every opportunity. He lives to be, say, nineteen and has spent his years in the malicious, although idiotic, torment of unintelligent, defenceless animal life. He has thus hindered many a spirit in its upward march and has beyond doubt inflicted pain and caused a moral discord. This fact of his idiocy is not a restoration of the discord. Every animal that he tortured had its own particular elemental spirit, and so had every flower that he broke in pieces. What did they know of his idiocy, and what did they feel after the torture but revenge. And had they a knowledge of his idiocy, being unreasoning beings, they could not see in it any excuse for his acts. He dies at nineteen, and after the lapse of years is reborn in another nation—perchance another age—into a body possessing more than average intelligence. He is no longer an idiot, but a sensible active man who now has a chance to regenerate the spirit given to every man, without the chains of idiocy about it. What is to be the result of the evil deeds of his previous existence? Are they to go unpunished? I think not. But how are they to be punished; and if the compensation comes, in what manner does the law operate upon him? To me there seems to be but one way, that is through the discord produced in the spirits of those unthinking beings which he had tortured during those nineteen years. But how? In this way. In the agony of their torture these

beings turned their eyes upon their torturer, and dying, his spiritual picture through the excess of their pain, together with that pain and the desire for revenge, were photographed, so to speak, upon their spirits—for in no other way could they have a memory of him—and when he became a disembodied spirit they clung to him until he was reincarnated when they were still with him like barnacles on a ship. They can now only see through his eyes, and their revenge consists in precipitating themselves down his glance on any matter he may engage in, thus attaching themselves to it for the purpose of dragging it down to disaster.

This leads to the query of what is meant by these elementals precipitating themselves down his glance. The ancients taught that the astral light—*Akasa*—is projected from the eyes, the thumbs and the palms of the hands. Now as the elementals exist in the astral light, they will be able to see only through those avenues of human organism which are used by the astral light in travelling from the person. The eyes are the most convenient. So when this person directs his glance on any thing or person, the astral light goes out in that glance and through it those elementals see that which he looks upon. And so also, if he should magnetise a person, the elementals will project themselves from his hands and eyes upon the subject magnetised and do it injury.

Well then, our re-incarnated idiot engages in a business which requires his constant surveillance. The elementals go with him and throwing themselves upon everything he directs, cause him continual disaster.

But one by one they are caught up again out of the orbit of necessity into the orbit of probation in this world, and at last all are gone, whereupon he finds success in all he does and has his chance again to reap eternal life. He finds the realization of the words of Job quoted at the head of this article: he is in "league with the stones of the field, and the beasts of the field are at peace with him." These words were penned ages ago by those ancient Egyptians who knew all things. Having walked in the secret paths of wisdom which no fowl knoweth and the vulture's eye hath not seen, they discovered those hidden laws, one within the other like the wheels of Ezekiel, which govern the universe. There is no other reasonable explanation of the passage quoted than the theory faintly outlined in the foregoing poor illustration. And I only offer it as a possible solution or answer to the question as to what is the *rationale* of the operation of the Moral Law of Compensation in that particular case, of which I go so far as to say that I think I know a living illustration. But it will not furnish an answer for the case of the punishment for reviling a righteous man.

I would earnestly ask the learned friends of the Editor of the *Theosophist* to give the explanation, and also hint to us how in this existence we may act so as to mitigate the horrors of our punishment and come as near as may be to a league with the stones and the beasts of the field.

CASTES IN INDIA*

BY DAMODAR K. MAVALANKAR, F. T. S.

NO man of sincerity and moral courage can read Mr. G. C. Whitworth's Profession of Faith, as reviewed in the April *Theosophist,* without feeling himself challenged to be worthy of the respect of one who professes such honourable sentiments. I, too, am called upon to make my statement of personal belief. It is due to my family and caste-fellows that they should know why I have deliberately abandoned my caste and other worldly considerations. If, henceforth, there is to be a chasm between them and myself, I owe it to myself to declare that this alienation is of my own choosing, and I am not cut off for bad conduct. I would be glad to take with me, if possible, into my new career, the affectionate good wishes of my kinsmen. But, if this cannot be done, I must bear their displeasure, as I may, for I am obeying a paramount conviction of duty.

I was born in the family of the Karháda Mahárashtra caste of Brahmins, as my surname will indicate. My father carefully educated me in the tenets of our religion, and, in addition, gave me every facility for acquiring an English education. From the age of ten until I was about fourteen, I was very much exercised in mind upon the subject of religion and devoted myself with great ardour to our orthodox religious practices. Then my ritualistic observances were crowded aside by my scholastic studies, but, until about nine months ago, my religious thoughts and aspirations were entirely unchanged. At this time, I had the inestimable good fortune to read "Isis Unveiled; a Key to the Mysteries of Ancient and Modern Religion and Science," and to join the Theosophical Society. It is no exaggeration to say that I have been a really living man only these few months; for between life as it appears to me now and life as I comprehended it before, there is an unfathomable abyss. I feel that now for the first time I have a glimpse of what man and life are—the nature and powers of the one, the possibilities, duties, and joys of the other. Before, though ardently ritualistic, I was not really enjoying happiness and peace of mind. I simply practised my religion without understanding it. The world bore just as hard upon me as upon others, and I could get no clear view of the future. The only real thing to me seemed the day's routine; at best the horizon before me extended only to the rounding of a busy life with the burning of my body and the obsequial ceremonies rendered to me by friends. My aspirations were only for more Zamindáries, social position and the gratification of whims and appetites. But my later reading and thinking have shown me that all these are but the vapours of a dream and that he only is worthy of being called man, who has made caprice his

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for May, 1880.

slave and the perfection of his spiritual self a grand object of his efforts. As I could not enjoy these convictions and my freedom of action within my caste, I am stepping outside it.

In making this profession, let it be understood that I have taken this step, not because I am a Theosophist, but because in studying Theosophy I have learnt and heard of the ancient splendour and glory of my country—the highly esteemed land of Aryávarta. Joining the Theosophical Society does not interfere with the social, political, or religious relations of any person. All have an equal right in the Society to hold their opinions. So far from persuading me to do what I have, Mme. Blavatsky and Col. Olcott have strongly urged me to wait until some future time, when I might have had ampler time to reflect. But the glimpse I have got into the former greatness of my country makes me feel sadly for her degeneration. I feel it, therefore, my bounden duty to devote all my humble powers to her restoration. Besides, histories of various nations furnish to us many examples of young persons having given up everything for the sake of their country and having ultimately succeeded in gaining their aims. Without patriots, no country can rise. This feeling of patriotism by degrees grew so strong in me that it has now prepared my mind to stamp every personal consideration under my feet for the sake of my motherland. In this, I am neither a revolutionist nor a politician, but simply an advocate of good morals and principles as practised in ancient times. The study of Theosophy has thrown a light over me in regard to my country, my religion, my duty. I have become a better Aryan than I ever was. I have similarly heard my Parsi brothers say that they have been better Zoroastrians since they joined the Theosophical Society. I have also seen the Buddhists write often to the Society that the study of Theosophy has enabled them to appreciate their religion the more. And thus this study makes every man respect his religion the more. It furnishes to him a sight that can pierce through the dead letter and see clearly the spirit. He can read all his religious books between the lines. If we view all the religions in their popular sense, they appear strongly antagonistic to each other in various details. None agrees with the other. And yet the representatives of those faiths say that the study of Theosophy explains to them all that has been said in their religion and makes them feel a greater respect for it. There must, therefore, be one common ground on which all the religious systems are built. And this ground, which lies at the bottom of all, is truth. There can be but one absolute truth, but different persons have different perceptions of that truth. And this truth is morality. If we separate the dogmas that cling to the principles set forth in any religion, we shall find that morality is preached in every one of them. By religion I do not mean all the minor sects that prevail to an innumerable extent all over the world, but the principal ones from which have sprung up these different

sects. It is, therefore, proper for every person to abide by the principles of morality. And, according to them, I consider it every man's duty to do what he can to make the world better and happier. This can proceed from a love for humanity. But how can a man love the whole of humanity if he has no love for his countrymen? Can he love the whole, who does not love a part? If I, therefore, wish to place my humble services at the disposal of the world, I must first begin by working for my country. And this I could not do by remaining in my caste. I found that, instead of a love for his countrymen, the observance of caste distinction leads one to hate even his neighbour, because he happens to be of another caste. I could not bear this injustice. What fault is it of any one that he is born in a particular caste? I respect a man for his qualities and not for his birth. That is to say, that man is superior in my eyes, whose *inner* man has been developed or is in the state of development. This body, wealth, friends, relations and all other worldly enjoyments, that men hold near and dear to their hearts, are to pass away sooner or later. But the record of our actions is ever to remain to be handed down from generation to generation. Our actions must, therefore, be such as will make us worthy of our existence in this world, as long as we are here as well as after death. I could not do this by observing the customs of caste. It made me selfish and unmindful of the requirements of my fellow-brothers. I weighed all these circumstances in my mind, and found that I believed in caste as a religious necessity no more than in the palm-tree yielding mangoes. I saw that, if it were not for this distinction, India would not have been so degraded, for this distinction engendered hatred among her sons. It made them hate and quarrel with one another. The peace of the land was disturbed. People could not unite with one another for good purposes. They waged war with one another, instead of devoting all their combined energies to the cause of ameliorating the condition of the country. The foundation of immorality was thus laid, until it has reached now so low a point that, unless this mischief is stopped, the tottering pillars of India will soon give way. I do not by this mean to blame my ancestors who originally instituted this system. To me their object seems to be quite a different one. It was based in my opinion on the qualities of every person. The caste was not then hereditary as it is now. This will be seen from the various ancient sacred books which are full of instances in which Kshatriyas and even Máhárs and Chámbhárs, who are considered the lowest of all, were not only made and regarded as Brahmins, but almost worshipped as demi-gods simply for their qualities. If such is the case, why should we still stick to that custom which we now find not only impracticable but injurious? I again saw that, if I were to observe outwardly what I did not really believe inwardly, I was practising hypocrisy. I found that I was thus making myself a slave, by not enjoying the freedom of

conscience. I was thus acting immorally. But Theosophy had taught me that to enjoy peace of mind and self-respect, I must be honest, candid, peaceful and regard all men as equally my brothers, irrespective of caste, colour, race or creed. This, I see, is an essential part of religion. I must try to put these theoretical problems into practice. These are the convictions that finally hurried me out of my caste.

I would at the same time ask my fellow countrymen, who are of my opinion, to come out boldly for their country. I understand the apparent sacrifices one is required to make in adopting such a course, for I myself had to make them, but these are sacrifices only in the eyes of one who has regard for this world of matter. When a man has once extricated himself from this regard and when the sense of the duty he owes to his country and to himself reigns paramount in his heart, these are no sacrifices at all for him. Let us, therefore, leave off this distinction which separates us from one another, join in one common accord, and combine all our energies for the good of our country. Let us feel that we are Aryans, and prove ourselves worthy of our ancestors. I may be told that I am making a foolish and useless sacrifice; that I cut myself off from all social intercourse and even risk losing the decent disposal of my body by those upon whom our customs impose that duty; and that none but a visionary would imagine that he, even though chiefest among Brahmins, could restore his country's greatness and the enlightenment of a whole nation, so great as ours. But these are the arguments of selfishness and moral cowardice. Single men have saved nations before, and though my vanity does not make me even dream that so glorious a result is within my humble grasp, yet a good example is never valueless, and it can be set even by the most insignificant. Certain it is that, without examples and self-sacrifices, there can be no reform. The world, as I see it, imposes on me a duty, and I think the most powerful and the only permanent cause of happiness is the consciousness that I am trying to do that duty.

I wish it understood—in case what has preceded has not made this perfectly clear—that I have neither become a Materialist nor a Christian. I am an Aryan in religion as all else, follow the Ved, and believe it to be the parent of all religions among men. As Theosophy explains the secondary human religions, so does it make plain the meaning of the Ved. The teachings of the Rishis acquire a new splendour and majesty, and I revere them a hundred times more than ever before.

FROM THE BOOK OF IMAGES

"UPON entering the state, he sees; upon leaving the state, he sees; while in the state, he is the state."

"Master, how is this? Is the sight different in different conditions of being?"

"The perceiving Power does not change. It is the same in all beings. Whether his sight is cast forward upon the state he is entering; or whether the sight is cast backward upon the state he is leaving; whether on this state, or that, or another, it is the same Power."

Having pondered these sayings, Ghadr Singh returned again to the Guru with further questions, for the modifications of the mind are many. As is well known, Ghadr means rebellion, and Singh was troubled with the insurrection of the mind, being unaware that the mind of man is not self-illuminative, is not all-inclusive, and is colored both from without and from within.

"Master, when I am with you, my mind is clear seeing, and the path is smooth. There are no difficulties and it seems certain that I will never again fall into error. When I am gone from you upon my own duties, there is once more division, and my faculties are confused. Some duties seem clear, but distasteful. Even as I consider the road to be followed, it disappears. I am alone and overborne."

"This is the witness within thyself that that which was said is true. Upon entering the state, the path is swallowed up in the state. Upon entering the form, the Soul loses its identity and becomes one with the form."

"But does not the identity of the Soul depend upon the form assumed?"

"Were this true, there could be no immortality for the Soul. With the destruction of the form, the Soul would cease. Therefore men say, He was born; he lives; he grows old; he is dead."

"Master, upon what does the Soul depend for its immortality?"

"Upon no thing at all. The Soul of man is Self-existent. It is one with the One. The Soul goes from state to state. There is no end to the states, for the Soul makes its own states. The Soul goes from form to form. There is no end to the forms into which the Soul enters, for the Soul is the creator of all forms. The mind of man is the sum of the states, both of the states which have been, and the states which are to be. The body of man is the modification within the state, both the bodies which have been and the bodies which are yet to be."

"Master, who or what, is the destroyer of forms?"

"The Soul of man is creator. The Soul of man is also the destroyer. This is to be learned by the Soul. His identity proceeds

from the One. The Universe is the image of the Self, and proceeds from the Self. The Soul imagines, I am this form; I am this state; I am this mind. These are temporal things. The Soul, being in its own nature immortal and free, wearies of its creations and imagines new and fair beauties, saying, there will I be happy forever. It casts its old bonds and enters into others which are new. This is Swarga for the Soul, to imagine new delights and to enter into them. It is Life to the Soul, while it identifies itself with its creations. The hells of the Soul are its efforts to free itself from old forms and conditionings."

"Is there then, no rest for the Soul, nor any freedom to be had? Cannot the gods give aid, nor the rites of religion provide benefits?"

"These also are the Soul's creations. These also are forms and states imagined by the Soul. In them the Soul delights until wearied. Then the Soul creates other gods, and enters into other ceremonies. If the own nature of the Soul is freedom, all states are limitations and bondage. They are animated by the Soul. When the Soul withdraws, where is the state? It is indrawn. It becomes an abstraction. There is this difference: the unemancipated live in the form and the state, like a spider caught in its own web. The emancipated rest in their own nature. This is knowledge, power, and bliss. They are like a spider which spins forth its web and indraws its web. They are not entangled in the web of creation. They put forth forms as a man puts forth speech, for another's hearing and instruction. They indraw forms, as a man becomes silent after giving direction. The power of speech resides in man, not in anything that he utters. The power of creation resides in the Soul, and not in its creations. As a man is intoxicated by his own power of speech and the words which he utters, the unwary Soul is intoxicated with the power of creation and the forms into which it enters. This is the road of unwisdom. It is the path of the descent of the Soul into the bondage of matter."

Ghadr Singh, giving gratitude to the Instructor, left the terrace of enlightenment, and returned toward his dwelling place filled with the illumination received, and determined to spin his web like a mother-spider, who spins that her young may be sheltered and nourished. He walked swiftly, pondering words of wisdom to be uttered for the guidance of men.

A stone rose up and bruised his heel. As the life in his member made out-cry, Ghadr Singh forgot the words of his wisdom, and spoke words of reproof to the road-mender, warning him against neglecting his duties.

At the field of the medlar trees a Vaisha waited, and made an offering for the fruit. Ghadr Singh, seeing that the price was insufficient for his needs, reviled the merchant, who went his way, silent but filled with bitterness, hating all Brahmans for their pride and conceit, which consider not the needs of another.

At the gate of the compound two children were playing at games. At sight of Ghadr Singh they shouted boisterously, making pretense, as is the way of Souls in small bodies. Ghadr Singh whipped them with harsh words for their trespass and unseemly conduct. The children went away crying and in fear.

Ghadr Singh sought his wife. In the women's quarter he found her, weeping. The sight distressed Ghadr Singh, who asked her the cause of her sorrow. After much urging she confessed that she had sat listening to the play of the children, taking delight in their mirth, and was grieving because they had been driven away unkindly.

Ghadr Singh reproved his wife with measured citations from Manu, pointing out the duties of wives and of children. His wife, being a religious minded woman and loving her husband, received his correction with meekness.

Ghadr Singh went to the prayer-room and meditated long and earnestly. His meditation was disturbed by the pain in his heel, by thoughts of the advantage sought to be taken of him by the merchant, by visions of the two frightened children, and by the memories of his wife's tears. Nevertheless, he forgave them all, both the animate and the inanimate, for the wrongs he had endured, and in this act of forgiveness found the satisfaction which he sought.

On his return to the Master next day, Ghadr Singh recounted to the preceptor the events that had befallen, and as the Master remained silent Ghadr Singh was moved to inquiries.

"Master, thou who have patience with my ignorance, and charity for my misunderstandings, and compassion when I err, tell me for my enlightenment how I may help all these beings so that they sin no more."

The Master's eye rested upon Ghadr Singh, but the Master spoke not at all. But Ghadr Singh, because he was under the eye of the Master, saw his own nakedness and was ashamed. He saw that he had had no patience with ignorance, no charity for misunderstanding, no compassion for errors, and that therefore the sins of all the others were his own sins, and that his meditation was but a potion he had taken to gain forgetfulness from his own wrongdoing.

Then the Master spoke kindly to Ghadr Singh.

"The doctrine of the head gives correction. The doctrine of the heart gives consideration. The doctrine of the heart sees Souls. The doctrine of the head sees sins. The head sees the state. The heart sees the Soul. The way of emancipation is the heart doctrine."

Ghadr Singh began to study the doctrine of the heart.

THE EIGHTH WONDER*

BY AN "UNPOPULAR PHILOSOPHER."

(Written in 1889.)

JUST back from under the far-reaching shadow of the eighth wonder of the World—the gigantic iron carrot that goes by the name of the Eiffel Tower. Child of its country, wondrous in its size, useless in its object, as shaky and vacillating as the Republican soil upon which it is built, it has not one single moral feature of its seven ancestors, not one trait of atavism to boast of. The architectural Leviathan of 1889 is not even—in the question of usefulness—on a par with the New York statue of Liberty, that would-be rival of the ancient Pharos. It is simply one of the latest fungi of modern commercial enterprise, grown on the soil of cunning speculation, in order to attract numberless flies—in the shape of tourists from the four points of the world—which it very conscientiously does. Even its splendid engineering does not add to its usefulness, but forces even an "unpopular philosopher" to exclaim *"vanitas vanitatum; omnia vanitas"*. Shall modern civilization still lift its nose and sneer at its ancient and elder sister?

The wonders of the world, the seven marvels of the Pagans, will never be replaced in our days. M. de Lesseps' admirers may look contemptuously back on the causeway built by Dexiphanes, three centuries before our conceited era, but the astral atoms of himself, as those of his son, Sostratus the Cnidian, may rest undisturbed and need feel no jealousy. The architecture of the marble tower of Pharos erected "to the gods, the Saviours, for the benefit of sailors" has hitherto remained unrivalled, in the public good derived from it, at all events. And this we may say, despite the creation of the Long Island statue of Liberty.

* * *

For verily, all the wonders of our age are destined to become but the ephemera of the century that is slowly approaching us, while they remain but the dreams and often the nightmares of the present era. All this will surely pass away and be no more. A seismic breath in Egypt may occur to-morrow and the earth will then "open her mouth" and swallow the waters of the Canal of Suez, and it will become an impassable bog. *A terremotos,* or worse still a *succussatore,* as they are called in South America, may lift the Long Island with its "Liberty" and toss them both a hundred feet high in the blue air, but to drop them down, covering their watery grave with the never-drying salt tears of the Atlantic Ocean. Who can tell? *"Non Deus præ videt tantum sed et divini ingenii viri"* saith sly Cicero in his *De Divinatione,* treating of cosmic phenomena. And the same thing threatens Lutetia that was, or Paris that is, and our own

* This article first appeared in *Lucifer* for October, 1891.

British Isles. No; never has God predicted as much as has the divine intellect of man; surely not. Nor would Cicero's feelings change, had he ever read the *War Cry* in his day or entertained a couple of Adventists. And what would be Cicero, after all, in the presence of a modern Materialist? How would he feel? I asked myself. Would he confess himself non-plussed, or would he remark—as Job did to the new philosopher, his persecutor—"Hast thou not poured (modern) wisdom out as milk and curdled it like cheese", enough to show us what it is?

* * *

Where are ye, O relics of the departed Pagan glories! Shall we suspect in you solar myths, or hope that we see a reincarnation of the hanging gardens of Babylon in the glass and iron whale and its two gigantic glass umbrella-sticks named the Crystal Palace building? Avaunt such insulting thoughts. The restless eidolon—if any be left—of haughty Semiramis can still admire her work in the astral gallery of eternal images, and call it "unparalleled". The *Mausoleum* of Artemisia remains unrivalled by that of the proudest raised only "to the gods of the Stock-Exchange, the Destroyers of mutual capital".

Fane of the Ephesian Diana, what temple shall ever equal thee in poetry! Modern statues, whether equestrian or pedestrian, that now fill the halls of the French Exhibition, which of you can ever put to blush the astral eidolon of the Olympian Jupiter by Phidias? To which of the sculptors or painters of our proud era shall a modern Philippus of Thessalonica address the words spoken to the divine Greek artist: "O Phidias, either the God has descended from heaven on earth to show himself to thee, or it is thou who hast ascended to contemplate the God!"

"No doubt but we are (not) the people, and Wisdom was (not) born with us", nor shall it die with us, let us add.

* * *

Long rows of pottery and bronzes, of cunning weapons, toys and shoes and other wares are daily inspected by admiring crowds on the Exhibition grounds. Well, the "unpopular philosopher" would unhesitatingly exchange all these for a glance at the collection of Mr. Flinders Petrie now to be viewed at Oxford Mansions. Those unique treasures have been just exhumed on the site of the Kahun, of the twelfth dynasty. Between the industry of the XIXth century A. D., and that of the XXVIth B. C. (accepting, to avoid a quarrel, the chronology of the modern antiquarians and excavators) the palm must be awarded to the latter, and it is easy to show why. All these weapons, domestic and agricultural implements, foreign weights, necklaces, toys, coloured threads, textiles, and shoes, now on view, have that unique feature about them that they carry us back to the days of Enoch and Methuselah, on the authority of Biblical chronology. The exhibits, we are told, relate to the twelfth

dynasty 2,600 years B. C., if we have to believe archæological calculations, *i. e.*, they show to us what kind of shoes were worn 250 years before the deluge. The idea alone that one may be gazing at the very sandals that have, perhaps, dropped from the feet of the first Grand Master and Founder of Masonry, Enoch, when "God took him", must fill the heart of every Masonic believer in Genesis with reverential delight. Before such a grand possibility, into what pale insignificance dwindles down the pleasure of inhaling the smell of Russian leather, in the shoe gallery at the Paris Exhibition. No believer in "godly Enoch, the first born of Cain-Seth-Jared", Khanoch the Initiator, no true Mason ought to run over to gay Paris, with such a treasure within his reach.

* * *

But we have still the Pyramids of Egypt left to us to admire and unravel—if we can. The Pyramid of Cheops is the sphinx and wonder of our century, as it was that of the age of Herodotus. We see only its skeleton, whereas the "Father of History" examined it with its outer coating of immaculate marble. It was defiled, however, with the record of 1,600 talents* spent only in radishes, onions and garlic for the workmen. Let us pause, before we turn our olfactory organ from the emanations of such unpoetical food. For with the ancients was wisdom, though it passeth now our understanding. Let us hesitate before we pass judgment lest we should be caught in our own craftiness. The said onions and garlic may be as symbolical as the Pythagorean beans. Let us humbly wait till better understanding descends upon us. *Quien sabe?* The beautiful outer casing of both the pyramids—of Cheops and Sen-Saophis—has disappeared, engulfed in the palaces of Cairo and other cities. And with them are gone inscriptions and engraved records and cunning hieratic symbols. Does not the "Father of History" confess his dislike to speaking of things divine, and does he not avoid dwelling on symbology? Let us seek light and help from the great learned Orientalists, the artificers of Greek Speech and Akkadian Lampesuk. We have hitherto learnt many a strange story. Perchance we may be yet told that these "radishes, onions and garlic" are but so many "*solar* myths" and—blush for our ignorance.

* * *

But what was the fate of the last of the Seven Wonders of the World? Where are we to look for the relics of the brazen giant, the Colossus of Rhodes, whose mighty feet trod upon the two moles which formed the gate of the harbour and between whose legs ships passed full sail, and sailors hurried with their votive offerings? History tells us that the *chef d'œuvre* of the disciple of Lysippus, who passed twelve years in making it, was *partially* destroyed by an earthquake 224 B. C. It remained for about 894 years in ruins. Historians are not in the habit of telling people what became of the re-

* £444,000 in English money.

mains of the six wonders; nor that every great nation possessed its seven wonders—witness China, which had its Porcelain Tower of Nankin,* now, as says a writer, only "found piece-meal in walls of peasants' huts". Yet it is rumoured in some old chronicles that the poor Colossus was sold to a Jew.

* * *

Queer volumes may be found at times in the shops of old Russian dissenters at Moscow. One of such is a thick infoglio in the Slavonian language called, "The acts, clerical and lay, from the Chronicles of Baronius, collected in old monasteries; translated from the Polish and printed in the metropolis of Moscow, in the year of the Lord 1791". In this very curious volume full of archaic facts and statements, historical and long forgotten records beginning with the year 1, one can read under the year A. D. 683, on page 706, the following:—

"The Saracen having destroyed and despoiled the Roman land ceaseth not his wicked depredation even on the sea.† Their leader Maguvius, strong and terrible, returneth to Rhodos the Island, marcheth to the brazen idol, whose name was Colossus *(sic)*, the idol exalted as the seventh World-Wonder, and which stood over the Rhodos harbour. His height was twenty-and-one-hundred feet *(stopa)*.‡ Soil-covered and moss-grown was the idol since its upper part fell to the ground, but he had remained otherwise whole to that very day. Maguvius overthrew the trunkless legs and *sold them with the rest to a Jew*. Sad was the end of that world wonder."

And elsewhere the chronographer adds that the Jew's name was Aaron of Edessa. He is not the only one to volunteer the information. Other old writers add that the Jew having broken up the Colossus, with the help of the Saracen warriors, into pieces, loaded 900 camels with them. The value of the brass material reached £36,000 English money in the Eastern markets. *Sic transit gloria mundi.*

* * *

Before the Jew and the Mussulman, moreover, the Rhodians themselves are said to have received large sums of money from pious donors to repair and put up the Colossus anew. But they cheated their gods and their fellow-men. They divided the money, the honest trustees, and put an end to legal enquiry by throwing the blame on the Delphic Oracle, which had forbidden them, as they averred, to restore the Colossus from its ruins. And thus ended the last of the Wonders of the old Pagan world, to make room for the wonder of the Christian era—the ever-speculating, money-making Jew. There is a legend in Slavonian Folklore—or shall we say prophecy?—that after the lapse of untold ages, when our globe will have become decrepit and old through wear and tear, underground

---

* Gutzlaff, *Hist. China*, Vol. I, p. 372.

† The original of this passage being written in old Church Slavonian can hardly be translated in all its originality, which is very queer.

‡ Some classics give it only 105 feet or 70 cubits.

speculation and geological zeal, this "best of the worlds possible"—in Dr. Pangloss' estimation—shall be bought at auction by the Jews—broken up for old metal, pounded into a formless heap, and rolled into balls as shares. After which the sons of Jacob and Abraham will squat around the sorry relics on their haunches, and hold counsel as to the best means of transferring it to the next Jewish bazaar and palming off the defunct globe on some innocent Christian in search of a second-hand planet. Such is the legend.

* * *

Se non e vero é ben trovato. At any rate the prophecy is suggestive even if allegorical. For indeed, if the Colossus of Rhodes could be sold for old brass to one Jew with such facility, then every crowned Colossus in Europe has reason to tremble for his fate. Why should not every Sovereign thus pass, one after the other, into the hands of the Jew in general, since they have been in that clutching grasp for some time already? If the reader shakes his head and remarks on this that the royal Colossi are not made of brass, but occupy their respective thrones "by the Grace of God" and are "God's anointed"—he will be meekly told that as "the Lord giveth, so the Lord taketh" and that he is "no respecter of persons". Besides which there is somehow or somewhere Karma involved in that business. Few are those Potentates who do not find themselves head over ears—golden thrones and breadless subjects—in debt with one or other king of Jewry. After all, the "Lord", by whose grace they are all enthroned, from the late King Soulouk to the latest Prince of Bulgaria, is the same El-Shadai, the omnipotent, the mighty Jehovah-Izabaoth, the god whom they, or their fathers—which is all one to him "to whom a thousand years are as one day"—have unlawfully carried off from his "Holy of Holies" and confined in their own altars. The sons of Israel are, in fact and justice, his legitimate children, his "chosen people". Hence it would only be a piece of retributive justice, a kind of tardy Nemesis, should the day come when the Jew, claiming his own, shall carry off as old material the last of the kings, before he proceeds to paint afresh, as new goods, the globe itself.

H. P. B.

IS CREATION POSSIBLE FOR MAN?*

The Editor of the Theosophist.

MADAME,

Talking the other day to a friend, who, like me, without being a Theosophist, takes a very great interest in the movements of your Society, I incidentally happened to remark that the "Brothers of the first section" were credited with such large powers, that even *crea-*

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for December, 1881.

tion was not at times impossible to them. In support of my assertion, I instanced their own cup and saucer phenomenon, as narrated by Mr. Sinnett in his "Occult World," which phenomenon appeared to me to be something more than the mere *reproduction, transference* or *unearthing* from its hiding-place of an article *lost* or *stolen*, like the brooch. My friend, however, warmly objected to my statement —remarking that creation was not possible to man, whatever else he may be able to accomplish.

Believing, as I then did, in Christianity as the most perfect heaven-descended code of ethics on earth, there was a time in the history of my chequered life, (chequered, I mean, as regards the vast sea of doubt and unbelief on which I have been tossing for over twenty years) when I would have myself as warmly, even indignantly, repelled the idea of creation as a possibility to man; but the regular reading of your journal, and a careful perusal of Mr. Sinnett's book and of that marvel of learning and industry your own "Isis Unveiled," have effected quite a revolution (whether for good or bad has yet to be seen) in my thoughts, and it is now some time since I have begun to believe in the possibility of phenomena beyond the range of my own narrow vision.

Will you kindly tell me which of us is right, my friend or I? Not having the honour of being personally known to you, I close this letter only with my initial. H.

OUR ANSWER

The question to be dealt with is hardly whether our correspondent or his friend is right, for we understand him to take up the prudent attitude of a seeker after truth who shrinks from affirming dogmatically that creation *is* possible for man, even while unwilling to accept the dogmatic negative assertion of his friend that "it is impossible." Before coming to the gist of the question raised, we have, therefore, to notice the illustrations which this letter affords of the ways in which such a question may be considered.

When our correspondent's friend denies that creation is possible for man, we can hardly assume that he does so from any conviction that he has sounded all the mysteries of Nature, and knowing all about the universe,—being able to account for all its phenomena—has ascertained that the process, whatever that may be, which he conceives of as creation does not go on anywhere in obedience to the will or influence of man, and has further ascertained that there is something in man which makes it impossible that such a process should be accomplished. And yet without having done all that, it is bold of him to say that creation is impossible. Assuming that he is not a student of occult science,—and the tone of the letter before us conveys the impression that he is not—our friend's friend when he makes his dogmatic statement, seems to be proceeding on the method

but too commonly adopted by people of merely ordinary culture and even by a few men of science—the method which takes a large group of preconceived ideas as a standard to which any new idea must be applied. If the new idea fits in with, and seems to support the old ones, well and good; they smile upon it. If it clashes with some of these they frown at it, and ex-communicate it without further ceremony.

Now the attitude of mind exhibited by our correspondent, who finds many old beliefs, shattered by new ideas, the force of which he is constrained by moral honesty to recognize, and who, therefore, feels that in presence of the vast possibilities of Nature he must advance very cautiously and be ever on his guard against false lights held out by time-honoured prejudices and hasty conclusions,—seems to us an attitude of mind which is very much better entitled to respect than that of his over-confident friend. And we are the more anxious to recognise its superiority in the most emphatic language, because when we approach the actual question to be discussed the bearing of what we have to say will be rather in favour of the view which the "friend" takes of "creations," if indeed we are all attaching the same significance to that somewhat over-driven word.

It is needless after what we have just said to point out that if we are now going to make some statements as to what is, and what is not the fact, as regards some of the conditions of the universe we are not on that account infringing the rules of thought just laid down. We are simply giving an exposition of our little fragment of occult philosophy as taught by masters who are in a position to make positive statements on the subjects and the credibility of which will never be in danger from any of those apparently inexplicable occurrences related in the books to which our correspondent refers, and likely enough, as he justly conceives to disturb many of the orthodox beliefs which he has seen crumbling around him.

It would be a volume we should have to write and not a brief explanatory note, if we attempted to begin, by elucidating the conviction we entertain that the Masters of Occult Philosophy above referred to are entitled to say what is and what is not. Enough for the present to say what we believe would be said in answer to the question before us, by *those who know*.

But we must have a clear understanding as to what is meant by creation. Probably the common idea on the subject is that when the world was "created," the creator accorded himself or was somehow accorded a dispensation from the rule *ex nihilo nihil fit* and actually made the world out of nothing—if that is the idea of creation to be dealt with now, the reply of the philosophers would be not merely that such creation is impossible to man but that it is impossible to gods, or God; in short absolutely impossible. But a step in the direction of a philosophical conception is accomplished when people say the world was "created" (we say fashioned)—out of

CHAOS. Perhaps, they have no very clear idea of what they mean by Chaos, but it is a better word to use in this case than "nothing." For, suppose we endeavour to conceive chaos as the matter of the universe in an unmanifested state, it will be seen at once that though such matter is perfectly inappreciable to ordinary human senses, and to that extent equivalent to "nothing", creation from such materials is not the production of something which did not exist before, but a change of state imposed upon a portion of universal matter which in its previous state was invisible, intangible and imponderable, but not on that account non-existent.* Theosophists-Occultists do not, however, use the word "creation," at all, but replace it by that of EVOLUTION.

Here we approach a comprehension of what may have been the course of events as regards the production of the mysterious cup and saucer described in Mr. Sinnett's book. It is in no way inconceivable that if the production of manifestation in matter is the act accomplished by what is ordinarily called creation that the power of the human will in some of its transcendent developments may be enabled to impose on unmanifested matter or chaos, the change which brings it within the cognisance of the ordinary human senses.

INDIAN PROVERBS†

TRANSLATED FROM THE SANSCRIT

Like moonbeams trembling on water, truly such is the life of mortals. Knowing this, let duty be performed.

The soul is a river whose holy source is self-control, whose water is truth, whose bank is righteousness, whose waves are compassion; bathe there, oh, son of Pandu, for not with water is the soul washed pure.

The mind of a king being severed, like a bracelet of crystal, who is the master to unite it?

Of a gift to be received or given, of an act to be done, time drinks up the flavour, unless it be quickly performed.

When the weak-minded is deprived of wealth, his actions are destroyed, like rivulets dried up in the hot season.

---

* It is one of the many reasons why Buddhist philosophy refuses to admit the existence and interference in the production of the universe of a direct creator or god. For once admit, for argument's sake, that the world *was* created by such a being, who, to have done so, must have been omnipotent, there remains the old difficulty to be dealt with—who then created that pre-existing matter, that eternal, invisible, intangible and imponderable something or chaos? If we are told that being "eternal" and imperishable it had no need of being "created," then our answer will be that in such a case there are TWO "Eternals" and two "Omnipotents"; or if our opponents argue that it is the omnipotent No. 1 or God who created it, then we return from where we first started—to the creation of *something* out of *nothing*, which is such an absolute absurdity before science and logic that it does not even require the final unanswerable query resorted to by some precocious children "and who created God!"—ED.

† This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for August, 1888.

ON THE LOOKOUT

President Wilson's efforts for peace have found many sincere tenders of co-operation in this country, as well as from other neutral and belligerent nations. The desirability of peace is not questioned anywhere, but there is a wide difference of opinion as to how peace may be achieved and maintained. Practically every country is feeling the effects of this fearful bloodshed and destruction, but the cry for peace, while general, is not uttered from similar motives. The Teutonic Alliance, seeing no prospect of accomplishing its aims, is willing to accept peace—at a price. The Allied nations consider that they have been forced into war, and will not accept a peace which does not place their opponents in such a position that aggression is made impossible. Leaving out of consideration those in our own country who are benefiting by the war, and who on that account are not anxious for a cessation of hostilities, there are found among the pacifists many different motives for their action, too many of these savoring of self-interest rather than of a desire to benefit humanity as a whole. There are those whose industries are suffering because of war restrictions; those who find a personal pressure in the high cost of living; those whose foreign travel is interfered with, and those who abhor war on general principles. It is the latter alone who can properly be called pacifists; yet among these there is found a lamentable ignorance of the causes that led to the present war, as well as an unreasoning sentiment that the cessation of hostilities will bring peace. They forget that the war broke out in the midst of what was considered peace, when peace conferences were quite the fashion, and treaties and alliances had been consummated in order to maintain the *status quo*. There is nothing in the published utterances of our President to show that he understands the cause of war, nor does there appear to be any sure peace foundation in the measures proposed to follow a declaration of peace. An International army and navy, to be generally accepted, would have to be composed of men and officers from all the nations concerned by agreement. The selection of such a personnel would provide occasion for much controversy, and even if tentatively settled, would contain the seeds of quarrels innumerable. The direction and control of such an army and navy could never by any possibility be free from national predilection in some way or another, and wherever forcible action was taken, hostility would be aroused. It would not, and could not be a peacemaker; on the contrary, it would afford more causes for differences between nations than would ordinarily exist. An International police force, keeping watch and ward over a lot of selfish and aggressive nations, would occupy no different position than does the police of a city towards selfish and aggressive members of a community; there is no love lost between them. But this is hardly a fair comparison: the police of a community have to deal particularly with but a small proportion of a city, for the majority of citizens are law-abiding, whereas it is notorious that nations will lie, steal and murder in a manner to be compared only with the worst of their elements, and all in the name of patriotism. A close examination of the facts of either war or peace shows that individuals will deal with each other generally in a more humane way than nations with each other, which would indicate that the *national idea* is a bar to real humanitarianism, a predisposing tendency to hostility. Nations express the worst elements of the pride, prejudice and aggression of their constituents; nor is it to be wondered at that this is so, for the individual knows and feels his responsibility, while the nation panders to the pride, prejudice and self-interest of its people, is in fact a cat's-paw for them and an evasion of responsibility. From all of which it appears that the only true and lasting basis of peace is a recognition that humanity comes from one common divine source; that all are proceeding towards the same goal of human perfection; that all differ in a

greater or less degree in point of progress; that it is the privilege and duty of those who know the most, to teach those who know less, those who have, to help those who have not. It is only by such a recognition that self-interest will give place to common interest, an interest as wide as humanity itself—a sure and permanent foundation for peace and happiness; nothing less will abolish war. In the words of a great world Teacher, H. P. B., it is "Theosophy first, and Theosophy last; for its *practical* realization alone can save the Western world from that selfish and unbrotherly feeling that now divides race from race, one nation from the other; and from that hatred of class and social considerations that are the curse and disgrace of so-called Christian peoples. Theosophy alone can save it from sinking entirely into that mere luxurious materialism in which it will decay and putrefy as civilizations have done."

In a recent issue of a Chicago newspaper, there is an article by Mr. Garrett P. Serviss, well known as a writer on scientific subjects, which is remarkable in its deductions when considered as a contribution from a votary of modern science. The title of the article is "When This Universe Dies, Eternal Energy Will Create Another One." The writer says in part " . . . the property of atomic disintegration (going to pieces), which radium conspicuously possesses, furnishes fresh evidence of the correctness of the astronomical judgment that the sun is mortal. It is true that the presence of a sufficient quantity of radium in the sun might possibly increase the length of time during which the sun will continue to be a sun from the twelve million years calculated by Lord Kelvin to six thousand million years. But that is not immortality . . . the great lesson that radium teaches is the perishableness of all things, with the single exception of that to which the word 'thing' hardly applies—energy. . . . The life of the atom being limited—although it is very, very long—the life of everything made up of atoms must necessarily be limited also. When the scientist stumbled upon the phenomenon of radio-activity, less than twenty years ago, he was like Adam beholding for the first time a dying man. What he had believed to be immortal turned out to be mortal. The atom appeared, of its own record, as a witness against its supposed eternity. For centuries the old alchemists had been smiled at as crazy though fascinating mystics, whose lives were passed in a waking dream. But now the atoms of one substance were seen in scientific laboratories, changing into the atoms of another substance, so that one assumption of the alchemists was proven to be true—viz, that if you can get down to the final elements of matter you may be able to handle them like building blocks, tearing down one edifice and constructing out of its bricks an entirely different one. The bricks are not the atoms as had been supposed, but the electrons of which the atoms are made up. And the electrons are not matter but energy! This apparent reasoning in a circle brings us around to the conclusion that fundamentally, there is nothing in the universe but energy; that everything that we see and touch, including ourselves, is simply a phase, or form of energy, while in regard to energy itself, about all that we can say is that it is that power which does and makes things. . . . The starry universe is like a shower of glittering sparks struck off from a blacksmith's anvil. The constellations that seem to us to glow with unending splendor, will be lost in the blackness of space, only to be replaced by another burst of sparks when the hammer falls again. . . . It is not the things that it creates, but it is creation itself that is eternal."

Not so long ago there prevailed a conception of the Universe which reduced the beginnings of all to *matter,* and considered all things and beings in their last analysis to consist of atoms and vacuity, and many were the scientific declarations made upon this conclusion, a conclusion which it now appears was erroneous. Now, it appears that science is forced to admit what the ancient wisdom has always declared "the constant dissociation of

the elements of matter or substance." This constant dissociation is now called "eternal energy" and is assumed to be "that power which does and makes things." This is certainly a step forward in the right direction, but it is only a step, for there remains yet to be determined the *cause* of energy, for the latter is a perceived *effect* and as such must have its predisposing cause; for energy does not exist of itself, that which produces it has yet to be discerned (not discovered, for it was known from time immemorial). Our painstaking scientists have concentrated their attention upon matter and its supposed ultimate constitution so exclusively, that they seem to have become incapable of considering anything else. The question as to whether the intelligence which discerns and learns in order to apply is not greater than anything known, or to be known, never appears to have occurred to them; yet there can be nothing more true than that the power to know is superior to any knowledge gained, for without that "power" there could be no knowledge. In order to have any perception there must be the "perceiver" and the thing perceived; for any action to occur there must be the "actor" and the thing acted upon. How much more rapid would be the advance of science, and how much more comprehensive the meaning of existence, did our best minds understand that there does exist an accurate, scientific and all-inclusive body of knowledge awaiting the hour of their attention. Every scientific discovery (?) made, only brings the hour nearer when it will be understood that the universe is embodied consciousness, and that the only reason for the existence of any universe is the evolution of Soul.

The *Saturday Evening Post,* of Philadelphia, is undoubtedly the most widely circulated journal in America. Every week some *two million* copies of this publication are printed, and it is safe to assume that at least *six million* readers are reached week after week. It is of great interest to Theosophists to note the growing tendency of the *Post* to admit to its columns stories of a distinctly Theosophical turn—not that the word "Theosophy" itself appears, or is even remotely suggested, but the stories often cannot be understood and appreciated except by reference to Theosophical teachings, and their application. Mention was made in "The Lookout" of last month of one such story, and a few weeks prior to the publication of "The Spreading Dawn," a powerful story of reincarnation and karma had appeared in the *Post.* In the issue of January 20th, under the title "Doubloon Gold," another "reincarnation and karma" story is published, written by Mr. John Russell. The fact that the characters in "Doubloon Gold" reincarnate in the same family line, and bear the same names as in their previous incarnation together, need not militate against its theosophical influence, despite the technical improbability of such an eventuality. The significance to Theosophists of these stories lies in the fact of the great number of people who will read and wonder about them—in some of whom, such pondering will "wake up" the old knowledge of the basic facts of life, which has been so long overlaid with the stifling integument of our present day modes and assumptions. "Doubloon Gold," aside from its theosophic implications, is a good story. Your friend to whom you are quite unable to "talk Theosophy," because he doesn't "like" the ideas, will enjoy it; and get perhaps that which he will not take from you—a "seed" idea that will sprout in due course and cause doors to open that have seemed quite hermetically closed.

Mention was made in the February "Lookout" of the report of a Grand Jury in Brooklyn, N. Y., which directed attention to the increasing criminal tendency of American youth and suggested a remedial campaign for the aid of parents. In this connection some comments in the biennial report recently

filed with the Governor of California by the State Board of Prison Directors are interesting. In attempting to account for the increasing population of the state prisons, the report declares that there appears to be an increasing disposition among parents to place pleasure above duty and to place much of the responsibility of parenthood on the state itself. The cosmopolitan population of California, comprising every race, color and creed, is another reason given for the large number of felons.

In discussing the responsibility of the home, the report says:

"It should be made the imperative legal as well as moral duty of parents to rear children properly. If the moral training of children is neglected, if they are not taught self-control, if no rules of home conduct are promulgated, or being promulgated, children are permitted to disregard or evade them, it may be expected that such children, as children or when grown, will not give due attention to rules of organized society."

This is all very well, as far as it goes. But how can parents who themselves have no knowledge of the basic facts of life give to their children sufficient reasons for right conduct—and every active thinking child asks for "reasons"? What the West most needs is an understanding of Reincarnation and Karma, as H. P. B. remarked so many years ago. But the cycle must run its course, we suppose, though all signs must urge the Theosophist to *promulgate*—ever to practise and promulgate—that any and all who have ears to hear *may* hear!

The Rev. William A. (Billy) Sunday closed in January a ten weeks' revival in Boston, leaving that city with a check for $50,826.64 as a "free-will offering" from his audiences. The "trail-hitters" numbered 60,510, according to a report, and 1,327,500 persons attended the services at the "$50,000 tabernacle." Among the "souls won" were "hundreds of Roman Catholics, Jews and Christian Scientists," says the New York *Sun*, though "Cardinal O'Connell's official publication had warned Roman Catholics that it would be a sin to hear Sunday." Readers of THEOSOPHY who are inclined to wonder how such "results" are obtained are invited to consider the article "Around the Table" in the present issue of this magazine, and make the needed applications for themselves. Mr. Sunday's "appreciation" of his treatment in Boston is quoted below:

"Boston's batting average for God is .900. She's not behind in history or culture (sic) or hospitality, baseball or religion. She trails nobody in anything. God be with you, old Scouts."

Billy's particular God probably will be—except that portion included in his check.